

In September 1817, at a dinner on the occasion of his departure from Kyiv, he suddenly firmly stated:

"When someone has the honor of being at the head of a people like ours... he should remain in his post only as long as his physical strength allows him to do so. After this period he must leave..."

The guests and the aide-de-camp protested, and the tsar replied with an expressive smile:

"So far I feel good, but in ten or fifteen years..."

In December 1818, a friend of his youth, his beloved sister Ekaterina Pavlovna, died. Alienation it grows with life ... Not at all sovereign thoughts and moods come ...

In the summer of 1819, maneuvers near Krasnoe Selo ended ... And Emperor Alexander asked for dinner at the twenty-three-year-old commander of the 2nd brigade of the 1st Guards Division, Nikolai Romanov.

The word I used "asked" here, I think, is quite appropriate, because the elder brother Decided to dine with my younger brother.

And after dinner, the emperor suddenly began a conversation that struck the august guardsman, by his own admission, "like thunder."

"Nicholas," the emperor said, "I feel bad and will soon lose the necessary strength to conscience to fulfill my duty as I understand it ...

At a quiet table, where, in addition to the brothers, there was also Nikolai's wife, Alexandra Fedorovna, pregnant eldest daughter Maria, it immediately became completely quiet ...

"So," Alexander continued, "I'm thinking of abdicating in the not too distant future..."

The silence is dead...

"Konstantin is childless, and has a natural aversion to the throne..."

Nikolai froze, and the elder brother finished:

"You will have to accept the dignity of a monarch over time ... The Tsar's daughter-in-law gasped and began to cry ... Nikolai could not stand it and began to cry too ...

- Well, well, brother, why? The king reassured him.

But I'm completely unprepared! I don't even have the heart for something so great!

- Yes, and I was not ready, and accepted the affairs in complete desolation, and I will hand over the power to you in full okay...

Alexander soon bowed out, and Nikolai was left alone with his feelings, as he himself wrote *"of a man walking calmly along a pleasant road strewn with flowers, and from which the most pleasant views open up, when suddenly an abyss opens up under his feet, into which an irresistible force plunges him, preventing retreat or turn back..."*

Georgy Ivanovich Chulkov is the author of a long-standing 1928 book "Emperors. Psychological portraits", from which I, having only expanded them into a dialogue, took this information (Chulkov himself took it from the biographer of Nicholas the First - Schilder, and he took it from Nikolai's notes), also said that Nikolai recorded this conversation only after seventeen years and something, according to Chulkov, could confuse ...

I still think it's unlikely ... Nikolai, like his brother, had an excellent memory, and such a conversation should was to cut into her deeply.

So, it was a conversation in the summer of 1819 ...

In February 1821, Alexander wrote for a week from the Austrian Laibach, where the next congress of the Holy Alliance was held, a long letter to Prince Golitsyn, in which now and then there were confessions like: "... the fear of public opinion has never been a hindrance for me ; *I only cared about the judgment seat of my own soul, which is all in God...*", "... *it is not up to me to overcome the attraction of the heart, but when it speaks, there is no human power to convince me against my inner attraction...*

At the same time, he quotes the Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Romans (chapter XIV, verse 23): "*He is condemned; for he acted against conviction, and everything that is done against conviction is a sin.*" And he adds: "*In general, you should read the entire XIV chapter, because it explains mutual relations based on faith.*"

If you follow the advice of the emperor and read the entire XIV chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, then the information to thinking turns out to be interesting - the reader here can take my word for it, or maybe he himself read it...

Grand Duke Nikolai Mikhailovich (I will often refer to him later), citing this letter in his monograph "Emperor Alexander I", writes that this letter bears the imprint of some kind of internal struggle and extraordinary nervousness.

Well, it is absolutely correct!

And in September 1921, Alexander, it would seem, shakes himself up and issues a decree making Russian America is definitively, legally Russian for all eternity.

He **finally** establishes over these lands the inalienable jurisdiction of the Russian crown ...

DEAR reader! I did not have the opportunity, and even the time, to analyze in detail - and even with a reconciliation of the chronology and sequence of many events - the entire last "Alexandrovsky" five-year period ... Which I am guilty of before you.

However, I am sure that I will not be mistaken if I say that the "American" Decree of Alexander was the peak of his then foreign policy.

It is possible (and even - most likely!), he was the peak of his entire foreign policy in general - in any case. case, psychologically!

Yes, and only in the psychological, if one is aware of the potential significance of this Decree?

Success in the Patriotic War of 1812 was, in fact, Kutuzov's success. The king could not do this in secret not understand, and was forced to admit it publicly.

But the Decree of September 4, 1821 - it was his personal triumph! After all, RAC was not only the brainchild of Shelikhov, Buldakov, Baranov ... She was also his brainchild! He also invested in it not only the capital, but also the soul!

It was not for nothing that he assumed half of the expenses for the voyage of Kruzenshtern!

He could not deprive the Russian-American Company of the proud right to take over one half. However, he could not and did not want to deny himself the proud right to visibly support, with the authority of the Russian monarch, Russia's right to the part of Russian America obtained by the sweat and blood of her sons!

Russian!

For twenty years, it really became Russian ... The Russians strengthened there and stood firmly. But the Anglo-Saxons also persistently strove to go there, although legally Alaska was in fact no different from Chukotka or Ryazan ...

The first glorious twenty Russian "American" years ended, privileges expired and the powers of the RAC to manage Russian possessions in America.

It's time to extend them...

And now, at the beginning of a new twenty-year mandate of the RAC, he, Emperor and Autocrat of All Russia, Moscow, Kiev, Vladimir, Novgorod, Tsar of Kazan, Tsar of Astrakhan, Tsar of Poland, Tsar of Siberia, Tsar of Tauric Chersonis, Tsar of Georgia, Tsar of Pskov and Grand Duke Smolensky, Lithuanian, Volynsky, Podolsky and Finnish, Prince of Estlyandsky, Lifyandsky, Courland and Semigalsky, Samogitsky, Bialystok, Karelian, Tver, Yugorsky, Perm, Vyatsky, Bulgarian and others; Sovereign and Grand Duke of Novgorod

Nizovsky lands, Chernigov, Ryazan, Polotsk and others and others and others (including the "ruler of the entire Northern country") By the decree declaring the Bering Sea zone as internal Russian waters, he committed an act of the greatest sovereign and geopolitical significance!

Not only the right of Russians to seals and beavers in this sea was the point here! Well, what was he up to cats?!

No, he committed, if you think about it, the greatest act not only of his reign, but also opened a new exciting page in the book of the great future of Russia! He logically and **legally** completed (and completed sovereignly, with dignity!) the work begun by Peter, continued by Catherine and ...

And - his father, so tragically devoted son!

I don't know, but I think that, signing this Decree, he was truly great and, perhaps, for the first time in his life, he was happy precisely as a sovereign, as an All-Russian supreme leader!

And he, who had become sophisticated in political combinations in Europe and had been correcting the position of the monarch of a great power for twenty (!) Very turbulent years, could not fail to understand that it was the Anglo-Saxons who could not but take up arms against him!

So what!

The Anglo-Saxons pitted him against Napoleon, thwarted his alliance with him and more and more perli to power over the world! They brazenly and impudently climbed into his rightful possessions, and at the same time, at all corners and in all nooks and crannies, they ranted about laws, about justice!

So, he will show them that he is in his right!

And now, after all this, instead of ensuring the great Pacific future of the Russian state Alexander was forced to go for an inglorious, embarrassing rejection of him ...

In the summer of 1822, instead of expanding the rights of Russia in America, Poletika had to be instructed to negotiate to diminish them ... Secret external forces with whom he sometimes contacted very closely, turned out to be stronger than him.

The crack grew...

Perhaps it was he, and at the same time his inner, carefully hidden indignation at these circumstances, that explains why it was in the summer of the twenty-second year, on August 1, that he ordered in a rescript addressed to the head of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, Count Kochubey:

Alexander obviously knew a lot - including about what the speech would soon be made up of Decembrists. In 1823, he also dismissed Kochubey, a Masonic functionary, and a number of other dignitaries. Masons...

But it does not give him strength or confidence.

He spent the end of 1822, as we know, in Verona, at the fourth and last diplomatic congress of the Holy Alliance, which took place from 20 (according to a new style) October to 14 December. Historians report that there he inexplicably often and strangely retired, was melancholic, which surprised Metternich and even seemed to admit that he would like to renounce ...

Still would! After all, even then he had to cancel his "American" Decree, Palen and Poletika conducted gloomy negotiations with the Yankees, and the Congress of Verona was just dedicated to "American" affairs.

The Anglo-Saxons - the ideologists of the murder of his father, were preparing to triumph once again ... And in South America, and in the North.

"Russia expert" Adams Jr. was already preparing "his" message to Congress for President Monroe, and the ideas of this message were already hovering over Verona and over the king.

The fracture grew and came closer to the heart ...

Perhaps it was out of annoyance at everything that was happening that he then succumbed to the provocation of Chateaubriand.

And he understood that this undertaking with the Spanish American colonies would not end in anything worthwhile and concrete, but he could not deny himself the bitter pleasure of at least annoying and scaring the Anglo-Saxons, at least with the specter of a new European coalition no longer against Napoleonic France, but against

Anglo-Saxon Union...

In 1820, the childless middle brother Konstantin, commander-in-chief of the Polish army, married a morganatic marriage to a gentry - Countess John (Janette, Irene) Grudzinsky, who received the title of Princess Lowicz.

In a manifesto dated March 20 (April 1), 1820, Alexander announced that members of the imperial family, those who marry persons of non-possessing blood are deprived of the right to the Russian throne.

On January 14, 1822, Constantine renounced his rights in a letter to his brother-emperor.

The childless Alexander enshrined this position in a secret manifesto of August 16, 1823, where the inheritance was passed on to their younger brother Nicholas.

However, this tsar hid the fact from almost everyone (at first, perhaps even from Nikolai), only by inscribing on the package handed over to Metropolitan Filaret: *"Keep in the Assumption Cathedral with state acts until my demand, and in the event of my death, open it to the Moscow diocesan bishop and to the Governor-General of Moscow in the Assumption Cathedral before any other action."*

At first, there was only this package - for Filaret, but the Metropolitan, who was privy to the secret (in fact, he drafted the manifesto), was reasonably surprised: Moscow, if the capital, is only ancient, the accession to the throne takes place in St. Petersburg ... On the advice of Filaret, copies of the manifesto were sent to the State Council, the Holy Synod and the Senate.

For most of 1822, Alexander wandered around Europe especially a lot: Vilna, Warsaw, Vienna, Verona ... He owes this circumstance his assessment - "wandering despot" ...

However, from the summer of 1823 and in 1824, he traveled a lot around Russia ... So, only from August 16 to October 24, 1824, he traveled around Penza, Tambov, Samara, Simbirsk, Orenburg, Ufa, Zlatoust factories, Perm, Yekaterinburg, Vyatka and Vologda ...

For me personally, all this looks like a kind of development of the "topography" of his future wanderings in Russia already as a private person, as an acquaintance with Russia for future purely practical purposes.

In the spring of 1824, the Capitulatory Russian-American Convention was signed in St. Petersburg.

And at about the same time, the tsar spoke to Prince Hilarion Vasilyevich Vasilchikov: "In the depths soul, I would not be upset if I could free myself from the crown, which is terribly pressing on me.

And on November 7, 1824, another terrible flood occurred in St. Petersburg - the same one described Pushkin in The Bronze Horseman.

As soon as the water subsided, Alexander went to the Galley harbor, went into the weeping crowd, looking at the destruction, he cried himself ... And in response to someone's sigh from the crowd: "God punishes us for our sins" muttered: "No, for mine" ...

On November 20, a trusted favorite, Count Fyodor Petrovich Uvarov, the commander of the Guards Cavalry Corps, died, who, together with Ataman Platov, distinguished himself at Borodino by a raid behind enemy lines, and then in the battles near Vyazma and Krasny ...

King Louis XVIII died in Paris... Although the monarch was useless, he was also a part of life.

And on December 13 (please note, on the 13th!) of December, sixty years old, Baroness Varvara-Julia Kridener (Krudener) died, who for quite a long time was so close (on the basis of common mystical inclinations) to Alexander that they spent hours in private conversations. The baroness even claimed that it was she who inspired the tsar with the idea of the Holy Alliance...

I am sure that the king, immersed in himself, was not only hit hard, but downright deafened by this death on the 13th! After all, the tsar, according to his biographer and cousin grandson of Grand Duke Nikolai Mikhailovich, had often been in a state of psychosis since 1821 (Nikolai Mikhailovich also used the harsher word "marasmus")...

Thus ended the year 1824...

In 1825, the Russian-English Convention on the Pacific Ocean was already signed ... And it was still more offensive, even more humiliating...

In the spring of 1825, the tsar informs the prince of Orange, who arrived in St. Petersburg, about his firm desire leave the throne and go into private life. The horrified prince vainly dissuades him from this intention.

The break is already in the heart ...

And on September 1, 1825, Alexander left the capital forever ... As one of the "negative" researchers of the Kuzmich version, G. Vasilich, writes, "the departure circumstances."

And they were really exceptional - judge, reader, for yourself!

The tsar set off at first alone, without retinue, from the Kamennostrovsky Palace. At half past five in the morning the stroller harnessed by a troika, stopped at the gates of the Alexander Nevsky Lavra.

In a frock coat without a sword, in an overcoat, in a cap, Alexander went through the gate, kissed the cross, sprinkled himself with holy water, accepted the blessing of Metropolitan Seraphim, ordered the gates to be locked behind him and headed along a long line of monks to the cathedral church, immersed in darkness, where it was brightly covered only cancer of Alexander Nevsky.

A long prayer began...

Then he went to the cell of the Lavra hermit Alexy and after a conversation with him began to pray again. Having finished his prayers, he asked the elder where he was sleeping. Alexy silently pointed to the black open coffin... The Tsar again accepted the blessing - from the schemer, and, crossing himself on the go, left the Lavra.

Behind the outpost, he ordered the horses to be stopped, got up in the carriage and for a long, long time, turning towards the city, looked at him...

Then he ordered to touch.

He left for Taganrog with the minimum possible accompaniment for a monarch: the head of the chief Headquarters Adjutant General Baron Dibich, Life Medic Baronet Willie, Dr. Tarasov, Wagenmey

erased by Colonel Solomka, four chief officers and a few servants.

Arriving in Taganrog, I began to settle in a small one-story house (I will dwell on it separately). Preparing for the arrival of the empress who soon followed him, he himself cleaned the paths in the garden, hung lamps in the rooms himself, hammered in nails for pictures and dragged sofas.

He seemed to be preparing not only for the arrival of his wife, but also for something else ... Is it not for his new life - no longer as a king, whom the whole state serves, but as a simple person serving himself with his own hands?

On October 20, in the same narrow company (Dibich, Willie, Tarasov, Solomka), Alexander leaves for the Crimea ...

In the Oreanda he bought from Count Kushelev-Bezborodko, he dreamed aloud:

- Soon I will move to the Crimea and will live as a private person. I have served twenty-five years, and the soldier is retired during this period ...

On November 3, the emperor drove up to Mariupol (this is a hundred kilometers from Taganrog) ... At the last station, he accidentally met with the courier Maskov, who was traveling from the capital, accepted papers from him and ordered to accompany him ...

On the way, the coachman drove and dumped the courier onto the bridge. Having hit his head, he remained motionless ... The Tsar left Tarasov with him with an order to personally report on Maskov's condition ...

Soon the doctor reported that the victim had died... The king's eyes sparkled with excitement... Maskov had a great external resemblance to him ...

And, as I suppose, the possibility of an early final suddenly opened up before Alexander.

But that was just the prologue to the finale...

DEAR my reader! There are few studies **directly** devoted to the version of "Alexander - Kuzmich". Contrary to its mysteriousness, for some reason there were almost no hunters on the topic. Of the three, perhaps, the main sources, two were available to me - the original (with "yats" and hard signs) "The Legend of the Elder Kuzmich and Alexander I" by G. Vasilich and the work of Prince Baryatinsky "The Royal Mystic (Alexander I - Fyodor Kuzmich)". The third is the study of Grand Duke Nikolai Mikhailovich "The Legend of the Death of Emperor Alexander I in Siberia in the form of Elder Fyodor Kuzmich", published in No. 7 of the Historical Bulletin for 1907, and then abroad on

German.

True, I had at my disposal the work of the august historian "Emperor Alexander I". Moreover, I must say, this work is very mediocre, not distinguished by depth (on the other hand, it is loyal) and is interesting primarily for the extreme awareness of its author (although he often simply keeps quiet about many things).

And we must also mention the "Posthumous Notes of Elder Fyodor Kuzmich" written by Leo Tolstoy ...

Tolstoy, by the way, became interested in the problem as early as 1890 (if not much earlier), that is, before the publication of the works of both Vasilich (fourth edition in 1911), and Nikolai Mikhailovich, and Baryatinsky (first edition in 1912) ... But this unfinished story was published only at the beginning of 1912 in Berlin, in Free Word, in the publication of the posthumous works of Count Tolstoy. In February of the same year, she appeared with banknotes in the Russian Wealth magazine. The issue was immediately detained by censorship, and Korolenko, who edited the magazine, was put on trial ...

There are very transparent hints in favor of the version and from such an authority as Nikolai Karlovich Schilder, who wrote the official history of the reigns of Paul and his sons Alexander and Nicholas...

As for Vasilich and Baryatinsky, I must say that when I read Vasilich's book, I continually ran into logical inconsistencies (the facts he cited contradicted his own conclusions).

By the way, there are grounds for assuming frequent inconsistencies (perhaps involuntary, due to the task of proving the opposite of the writer's apparent position) in the grand ducal work. Nikolai Mikhailovich, with the obvious illogicality of the conclusions from the facts he himself reported, seemed to hint to readers - think for yourself whether I agree with the version that "Kuzmich - Alexander" is a legend.

At the same time, when I read "just Prince" Baryatinsky, I keep on reading. noted the opposite picture - he met with him the same logical considerations in favor of the version of "Alexander - Kuzmich", which had already been came to my mind...

Vladimir Vladimirovich Baryatinsky, born in 1874 in St. Petersburg and died in Paris in 1941, brought up in close friendship with the sons of Alexander the Third, from the "Rurikovich", son of the nee Countess Stenbock-Fermor and grandson of the governor of the Caucasus, lack of information - written and unwritten, about the Alexander era, he did not experience, as well as a lack of literary talents, at the same time being an independent person and critical of the prejudices of the noble bureaucratic environment.

And his work in substantiating the identity of the emperor and the elder looks very convincing both in fact and in logical terms. By the way, according to the assumption (and by no means groundless) of Baryatinsky, in the Alexander Nevsky Lavra, not a prayer service was served before the emperor's, in principle, habitual and frequent next departure from the capital, but a memorial service was served ! Hence the locked doors, and the absence of weapons, and the mystery of the rite, and the deaf subsequent rumors about its essence ...

The Tsar returned to Taganrog on November 5, with a slight malaise ... And Baryatinsky very carefully and critically analyzed the records of those who were next to Alexander from the beginning to the middle of November, that is, his wife, Prince Volkonsky, physicians Willie and Tarasov.

One way or another, the date of the death of the emperor was November 19, 1825 ... And the events after this date turn out to be as contradictory as the life of the king before it. It would be interesting to describe and analyze them, but I have so much more to say about Alexander that I simply cannot dwell on the details without really risking deviating unacceptably far. Let me just say that

rumors about the replacement of the emperor by someone else spread almost immediately, that the few who knew the emperor during his life and saw the face of the deceased, they believed that his features had changed a lot (which Nikolai Mikhailovich directly admitted), that there were many problems and oddities on the inexplicably long journey of the mourning "train" almost to its very end ...

BTW, when I thought about Alexander and replenished my knowledge about him, I was struck by how persistently his fate in his last year of reign was connected with that number "13", which could not help but stand before his eyes every time he remembered the death of the baroness Krudener...

And not only about her.

He returned to St. Petersburg from his many wanderings in Russia for the last time on June 13, 1825 (this date, as well as subsequent ones, is given according to the old Russian style) ...

By the way, he returned from Warsaw - after the opening of the third Polish Sejm, which was opened by him May 1, old style, but May 13, European.

Coincidence? Maybe...

But he returned to Tsarskoye Selo from Warsaw on June 13 ...

But his last day in St. Petersburg falls on September 13, European style...

But, having left the capital, never to return to it again, in the morning of September 1, he arrived in Taganrog on September 13 ... Twelve days on such a road at that time was very little (it turns out that he did more than a hundred kilometers a day). The empress, who followed him on September 3, spent twenty days on the same journey.

So, it turns out that he was clearly, for no apparent reason, in a hurry. On the way there were no regular reviews, no maneuvers, no parades, except for a small inspection delay in the Chuguev military settlement.

Was the tsar in a hurry because he consciously urged the arrival to his last "royal" station exactly to the "magic" date?

For some reason, he also left Petersburg just on the eve of the four-year anniversary of the signing of the Decree of September 4 (his reign also ended on a symbolic date - on the three-year anniversary of the end of the fateful Congress of Verona).

Further...

Alexander agreed to the first consultation on November 13 ... Baryatinsky, who quoted Willie and Volkonsky, I, however, did not come across this detail, but Vasilich has it!

It's also strange ... He didn't feel well (according to Willie) for far from the first day, but here it is - exactly on the 13th to the persuasion of Willie "surrendered" ...

The choice of a place of life in Taganrog is also poorly explained ... The Taganrog "palace" - the last dwelling of the emperor, was a small one-story stone house.

At the same time - with 13 again, windows to the street ...

Historians tell us that the tsar came to Taganrog in 1825 because the seriously ill Empress Elizaveta Alekseevna (she died in 1826) was recommended to spend the winter in the south. And the choice of doctors, they say, fell on Taganrog ... Doctors, however, seemed to point to Italy, Southern France or "Southern Russia" ...

Grand Duke Nikolai Mikhailovich explains the refusal to go abroad by the fact that nervous, they say, Empress Elizabeth from one such thought came into disarray.

Well, so be it ... But what - she personally insisted on Taganrog, completely unknown to her?

So Taganrog was chosen, it seems, by the tsar himself ...

I don't know why the windswept city turned out to be so attractive compared to the weak Crimea recommended to everyone ... Contemporaries did not understand this either, for example, the tsar's friend and his adjutant general, Prince Pyotr Mikhailovich Volkonsky.

I understand that it is ridiculous to associate this choice with the 13 windows of the "palace", although the choice of Taganrog itself is more than incomprehensible. If you do not take into account its remoteness from large centers and the complete absence there - unlike the Crimea - of the nobility having a rest.

But what was the reason for the king's choice of the dwelling that he chose? It was he who, upon arrival in Taganrog, could have settled in a more decent place. Taganrog was a rich port and trading city where one could find a place to stay...

In addition, it was supposed, after all, that the spouses would live there all winter, and the empress was apparently ill. And now, instead of maximum comfort - almost, according to St. Petersburg concepts, not a shack of ten rooms with the most modest furniture.

It is unlikely that such a wretched dwelling could have been chosen for the imperial couple by anyone other than himself. king. And he could choose it only upon arrival, because how could he know the local "topography" in advance?

Although ... Alexander was in Taganrog in 1818 and could accidentally notice a thirteen-windowed house, and then remember it on his second visit ...

So, wasn't the choice, if not the city of "death", then the choice of the place of "death" determined by the fact that did the emperor, seeing a house with 13 windows, decide to once again introduce the number "13" in his last royal days?

After all, I didn't count myself how many windows to the street were in this Taganrog "palace" ... For some reason, the biographers of the emperor report this seemingly insignificant fact (I took this detail from Vasilich again)!

By the way, the very modesty of the choice proves that Alexander hardly expected that life in Taganrog would be long and that Elizaveta Alekseevna would live there with him all winter. Although she did not actually go to bury her husband, but left Taganrog only in April 1826 ... Which is also Weird...

Finally, the last Alexander's "13" turned out to be already "posthumous" ... After the body of the tsar (is it just a tsar?) On February 28 (this is also, by the way, somewhere around March 13 in European style) 1826 was delivered to the capital, after the prescribed rites for more than one day, the funeral procession headed from the Kazan Cathedral to the Peter and Paul Fortress for some reason on March 13, and even with a strong snowstorm ...

Perhaps these were all coincidences. But maybe it was something else?

And was it not so that all this was hidden, Masonic, hints with which Alexander staged his "demise"?

After all, he was well acquainted with Masonic symbols and rituals, and with the very hidden spirit of Freemasonry. Of course, he knew how this secret union of high-born perverts and homeless degenerates without a homeland loves such hints that, for all their transparency, would say nothing to the initiated "profanes" ...

And, perhaps, breaking with everything worldly, he - as he was somehow accurately defined - "Byzantine", with this number "13" scattered here and there in his last "royal" year, hinted at a powerful world force: "If I did not find in myself the sovereign strength and power to tell you: "Get out, Satan," then I still have enough personal spiritual strength to get out of the world of worldly vanity subject to you "...

By the way, on March 13, 1820, he expelled the Jesuits from Russia.

The very difference in the then Russian and European chronology of 12 (then, in the 19th century, 12) days created additional opportunities for such a subtle game-hint: the first day of the Russian month

was the thirteenth day of the European.

I don't know if that was really the case. But I do not rule out that in fact it was just that ...

AS I ALREADY said, immediately after the death of the emperor, there was a rumor that he was not dead.

Already later, on February 28, 1826, Prince Alexander Sergeevich Menshikov wrote in his diary that Prince Volkonsky, who was under Empress Elizabeth, believed that "the late Sovereign *really came to mind to abdicate the throne*" and he was "able to retire to *monastery*"...

If Alexander really renounced in such a non-standard way, then Pyotr Mikhailovich Volkonsky was one of initiated... And the huge psychological burden of knowledge could cause such a semi-recognition...

The rumor excited and excited, and was it not for this reason that Nikolai hesitated to accept supreme power even after he knew for sure about the true state of things (previously he knew about the abdication in his favor, perhaps only from the words of the grandmother-empress said in passing)?

What if the big brother changes his mind? What if he decides again, as he did in his life no longer once?

Konstantin sharply refused ...

Time passed, no one appeared on the throne. And it was necessary to sit on it to the one to whom Alexander himself determined it.

That is, Nicholas ...

He became emperor, and in the summer of 1826 he was crowned ... And in the diary of Nikolai's wife, Empress Alexandra Feodorovna, on August 15, 1826 - during the days of the coronation, such a curious entry appeared: "Probably, when I see the people, I will think about how the late *emperor*, *speaking to us once about his renunciation*, he said: *"How I will rejoice when I see you passing by me, and I, lost in the crowd, will shout "cheers" to you ..."*

These words, not even mentioned by Schilder, were cited in his "anti-Kuzmichevsky" work by Grand Duke Nikolai Mikhailovich, which, according to Baryatinsky, "showed great courage and impartiality" ...

Maybe - and so ... Or maybe it was an important allusion to the truth, the opposite of the statements ... of Nikolai himself. After all, as Nikolai A. Golombievskiy wrote in a review of the work: "With the advent of ... the research of the Grand Duke ... in different parts of Russia, a keen interest arose in an almost forgotten issue, new data were reported in the press to confirm the legend, the publication of a biography of materials about Fyodor Kuzmich is being undertaken".

Doesn't all this mean that Nikolai, not having, as a member of the august family and, as such, a relative of Alexander, the opportunity to tell the truth known to him, chose such an original method to attract the interests of the problem?

I do not exclude even the consistency in the actions of the Grand Duke Nikolai Romanov and the "just" prince Vladimir Baryatinsky!

ALREADY after writing all of the above, I discovered very important evidence that, in fact, the august historian Nikolai Mikhailovich was directly convinced of the opposite of what he himself publicly stated.

Nikolai's brother, Grand Duke Alexander Mikhailovich, was the son of Grand Duke Mikhail Nikolaevich, the grandson of Emperor Nicholas I, the nephew of Emperor Alexander II,

cousin of Emperor Alexander III and, as such, cousin of Emperor Nicholas II.

In exile, Alexander Mikhailovich wrote interesting memoirs, which, incidentally, he directly began with a description of the departure of his great-uncle Alexander the First from the Taganrog "palace" into obscurity ... But more than that! The cousin of Alexander reports that his grandfather Nikolai, during one of his travels in Siberia, "expressed a desire to talk with an old man known as Fyodor Kuzmich, and made a long detour from the path to visit his wretched hut in the wilderness of Siberia" ...

And then the grand-ducal text is as follows: "The meeting took place without witnesses. The emperor stayed face to face with the elder for more than three hours. He left it in deep thought. It seemed to the retinue of the king that there were tears in his eyes" ...

"My late brother," continues the august memoirist, "Grand Duke Nikolai Mikhailovich, working for several years in our family archives (let me remind the reader that these "archives" were personal papers of the imperial family! - S.K.), tried to find confirmation of *this* amazing legends. He believed in its plausibility, but the diaries of our grandfather Nicholas I, oddly enough, do not even mention his visit to Elder Fyodor Kuzmich ... "

The biochronicle of the life of the Russian emperor is something that is recorded with the most detailed details. So there can be no doubt about the fact that the emperor visited the elder, as well as about the fact of the absence of diary entries ...

But their very absence is more than convincing. If the elder were just an elder, then the record of personal debunking of the legend in Nikolai's diary simply had to be ...

If the reigning emperor discovered the hiding emperor in Kuzmich, he discovered native older brother, then ...

What kind of "records" can we talk about here! After such a shock, it's just right to put on a hood!

A little wise (although - who knows, maybe, on the contrary - Jesuitically wise!) A. Golombievskii fully approves the work and conclusions of Grand Duke Nikolai Mikhailovich and cites his own, extremely strained considerations. The most "strong" of them is, perhaps, the reasoning that, they say, Elizaveta Alekseevna, dying six months after November 19, 1825 "from complete exhaustion" in Belev, wrote on May 3 to her mother: "Notre Ange est au ciel , *et moi, je vegette encore sur la terre...*" (Our *angel is in heaven, while I still vegetate on earth*). Like, she couldn't pretend like that! Moreover, "*Notre Ange*" was the emperor's family nickname.

Well, without having tender feelings for her husband (and this is reliable), the empress could well, in first, and pretend.

Yes, most likely she simply portrayed the official "grief" - after all, her husband also did not have tender feelings for her (and this is also reliable).

Secondly... What could the written mean? If her husband was actually alive, then from the moment of his "death" she must have been in a state of severe continuous stress, although her husband did not loved...

Now, if the king really died, then there would be no stress. And he was! So a quick death - without quotes - the empress here may be another confirmation in favor of the version.

At the same time, in addition to dealing with stress, it was also necessary to resort now and then to allegories, to defaults. And did this refer to her "*Notre Ange*" (used by her in the November letters of 1825)

not to her husband, but to her daughter Mary, who died in infancy in 1800? If this is so, then she, using the impersonal "our angel" as a trick, on the one hand, did not formally lie, and on the other hand, she worked for a new interest retired from the throne of the emperor.

Moreover, the spouses, I repeat, did not feel especially tender feelings for each other from the very beginning of the marriage, somehow strangely drawing closer only at its end ...

And again, a strange oddity that ceases to be such only when the version of Alexander's departure, and not the death, is admitted ... As soon as Elizabeth died in Belev, forgotten by God, not far from Kaluga, her mother-in-law, Dowager Empress Maria Feodorovna personally arrived in the city, took all the papers of the deceased, in Petersburg, I read them with my son-emperor, and then ... burned them.

For what?

Shortly before her death, Maria Fedorovna also ordered her long-term diaries to be burned. And she led them for half a century.

For what? Just to burn?

Hardly...

But if there was something in them that shed light on the secret of secrets, then burn only the diaries, starting with autumn of 1825, meant to almost reveal this secret ...

And it turned out that it was necessary to burn everything.

The same A. Golombievskiy sees proof of the truth of the Emperor's death in "the extraordinary agreement of all the witnesses (including Elizaveta Alekseevna), who wrote at different times, on different occasions and in different ways (notes, memoirs, letters, etc.)" with the "most petty testimony" of Dr. Tarasov and other doctors about the course of the disease ...

But it is precisely in this "unusual agreement" that a more or less competent analyst will see evidence of just the opposite, namely, that all those who wrote wrote, so to speak, from dictation, that is, they had the same pattern before their eyes while writing!

However, Prince Baryatinsky showed that there were enough contradictions in the "evidence" ... And he also sent out a "posthumous" epicrisis for diagnosis to several prominent Russian doctors, naturally removing the words "sovereign emperor" from it ... The results are impressive: the diagnosis of typhoid fever - the official reason for the "death", did not put any of them!

And in the autumn of 1836, he rode up to the forge in the vicinity of Krasnoufimsk on a beautiful horse a prominent, handsome man of about sixty and asked the blacksmith to shoe her ...

The client's manners were soft, but lordly, the clothes were peasant ... The inquisitive blacksmith began to question, then other curious people approached, but the answers were evasive. As a result, the rider was detained and, without any resistance from his side, was taken to the city. There he called himself a peasant Fyodor Kuzmich and declared himself a vagabond with no memory of kinship.

He was beaten with batogs ...

Grand Duke Nikolai Mikhailovich in his work "Emperor Alexander I" sees in this punishment the proof of the absence of the identity of the "tramp" and the emperor. They say that a person like Alexander could "voluntarily go to this kind of public torture."

But in 1836 it was no longer the emperor! He called himself Kuzmich - be ready to lie down on the bench. But the blooming appearance of a "tramp who does not remember kinship" just confirms the version of the emperor-Kuzmich!

After the punishment of Kuzmich, Grand Duke (!) Mikhail Pavlovich appeared in Krasnoufimsk. He arrived there at the direction of Nicholas the First, to whom the strange story strangely reached. Mikhail Pavlovich visited the tramp right in the prison, dismantled the authorities, but Kuzmich himself asked to be exiled to Siberia, which was done ...

It is also tempting to write more about his life in Siberia, but if I deviate from the topic in the course of my narrative, it is only in the interests of the topic. And therefore, it will be necessary to report only some of the vast and most interesting information - for example, that the elder lived there in several places, not constrained by anyone, that he amazed with knowledge of the upper world, education, memory, which constantly through wanderers received information about the state of affairs in Russia and carried on a mysterious correspondence that one of his favorites, the young peasant woman Sasha, was received and treated kindly by Tsar Nikolai, that the elder knew something that he seemed to be unable to know ...

All this and much more is not denied even by Vasilich and Grand Duke Nicholas.

There are almost no autographs left from the elder, and the available ones are written intricately, but in fact printed, free-standing letters, as if the handwriting was hidden ...

Different people often came and came to the elder ... He once had ... Count Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoy. I arrived in the morning, stayed until late in the evening ... Then I left ...

If we recall how often later Tolstoy was visited by a desire to go into obscurity, and that he eventually made such an attempt, then the fact of his conversation with Kuzmich can illuminate a lot in the writer's biography, at first glance incomprehensible ...

And the story of this favorite of the elder Kuzmich and the acquaintance of Tsar Nicholas - Sasha, Alexandra Nikiforovna?! The story is absolutely fabulous and at the same time cited as reliable by Vasilich himself ... One careful reading of it can convince the emperor and the elder of the identity!

And the most interesting - including because it was done in passing - the message of Prince Hilarion Sergeevich Vasilchikov?

The prince, a prominent statesman and Duma figure of the early 20th century, came from an ancient family of Chernigov boyars who moved to Moscow in the 15th century. Anna Vasilchikova was the fifth wife of Ivan the Terrible, the Vasilchikov brothers: Hilarion, Dmitry and Nikolai Vasilyevich - heroes of the Patriotic War of 1812, whose portraits by Dow are in the Military Gallery of the Hermitage. The Vasilchikovs for centuries belonged to both the aristocratic and the service elite, were dedicated to many things and were involved to a lot...

That Vasilchikov, who left memoirs "What I remembered..." in exile, was born in 1881 and died in 1969 and does not cause much respect for me. But as for the facts (especially the pre-revolutionary period), then, as a rule, you can believe him. By the way, his daughter, Missy Vasilchikova, was also not alien to literary inclinations and became the author of the famous "Berlin Diary", also in terms of facts - not false.

So this is what Vasilchikov writes about his grandfather Nikolai Vasilyevich Isakov, who headed management of military educational institutions under Alexander II:

"When visiting military schools, my grandfather also had to visit Siberia. The courier Mikhailov, who constantly accompanied him, said that when he was in Siberia, my grandfather each time stopped by the grave of the famous elder Fyodor Kuzmich, located near the city of Tomsk.

The courtier and the elder ... What could bind them? First, oddly enough, silk stockings ...

Isakov began to oversee military educational institutions from 1860 - four years before the death of the elder. AND

already Vasilchikov-great-grandson (the son of a memoirist, Georgy Ilarionovich) explains in the comments to his father's memoirs from the words of his aunt Countess Adlerberg that when the elder was still alive, George's great-grandfather went to inspect the Irkutsk infantry school, and on the way he stopped in Tomsk to visit "the hermit Elder Fyodor Kuzmich, well-known throughout Siberia" and to hand over to him "on behalf of Sovereign Alexander II a package that Mikhailov was ordered to cherish like the apple of his eye all the way" ...

The package contained "many pairs of silk stockings"... Why? Georgy Vasilchikov explains: "The contents of this package ... to the ignorant may seem like a strange gift for an old hermit. But it's not so strange, if you remember that Alexander I, during the exercises in the winter cold, which his father insisted on for the sake of tempering his health, so frostbitten his legs that they were covered with something like eczema, and he no longer tolerated ordinary calico or woolen stockings, only silk, which were specially ordered for him from France ... Even Napoleon ... nobly gave special

permission for the Lyon sericulture ... to export the goods to their enemy.

There was also a second connecting moment ... It was quite appropriate to use Isakov as an opportunity in such a delicate matter, and here's why ... According to Georgy Vasilchikov, his great-grandfather, born on February 10, 1821, was the illegitimate son of ... Alexander the First and a pupil of the Moscow Catherine Institute, a beauty orphans Katenka Karacharova, who at the beginning of her pregnancy was urgently married to the young aide-de-camp of Tsar Vasily Isakov. (Nikolai Isakov was personally informed of this by Nicholas the First in 1848, when his affair with the emperor's daughter, Grand Duchess Olga, was already outlined. "Isakov" - by the way, like two drops of water similar to the son of Nicholas the First, the future Alexander II (actually, his cousin) - she was also actually a cousin, and marriage between them was impossible according to the laws of the Orthodox Church.)

The memoirist himself, Vasilchikov the father, writes: "Historian N.K. Schilder (1842-1902) was at one time adjutant of the hero of the Sevastopol defense, General Totleben, whose son told my father that, being admitted to all, even the most secret archives, he was convinced in his soul of the identity of Alexander I and Fyodor Kuzmich, although about this it was not supposed to speak, mainly because by that time the monarchy was already subjected to systematic slander ... and to admit that in 1825 a forgery was committed in Taganrog ... would mean even more to discredit it.

Similar stories, both accurately reliable and unreliable, I read more in the course of my work.
than enough...

Well, let's say, here is such a significant "coincidence" ...

After November 19, 1825, a package was found in the pocket of the royal dress, with which the emperor never parted ... They thought that it contained a will, but it turned out that there were two prayers and notes from Holy Scripture.

Kuzmich, dying, did not reveal his name, but pointed to the bag that always hung at the head of his bed with the words: "It contains my secret ..." And they found only two (!) Either incoherent or encrypted notes in the bag on strip paper...

"Fyodor Kuzmich" died on January 20, Russian style, 1864. The age of the elder at the time of his death determined at about 87 years old ... That would have been exactly the same for Alexander, who was born in 1777.

The elder was buried at the cemetery of the Tomsk Bogoroditse-Alekseevsky Monastery ...

In Fyodor Kuzmich's "SECRET" there was a phrase interpreted by Baryatinsky cleverly and, as it seems to me, accurately ... The elder wrote: "But always ah. (Baryatinsky has "A" capitalized and without a dot, but in the original "a" is lowercase and with a dot, which is perhaps significant. - S.K.) they are silent, P. do not announce.

Baryatinsky reveals the meaning of the entry as follows: "But when the Alexanders are silent, the Pauls do not announce", i.e.: "When Alexander keeps silent, he is not tormented by remorse regarding Paul..."

Yes, Pavel, his devoted father, became an eternal reproach for Alexander. It seems that he considered both his childlessness and Constantine as a punishment for their complicity in parricide. My father had ten (!) children - Alexander's brothers and sisters. His brother Nikolai has nine (six of which were born before 1826) ...

And Alexander and Konstantin - not a single one! Alexandra's daughter died as an infant.

So there is a reason in the interpretation of Baryatinsky ... I'll already note that then the lowercase "a" is understandable when capital "P" ... The son diminished before his father ...

But even more interesting - and interesting for our main topic! — prince's explanation phrases on the second note: "a. strufian are covered.

Interested in the word "strufian", the prince found Dahl: "Strous, ostrich, coward and coward, strufion, strophion ... *There will be villages of Sirin and settlements of strufion, Icaia.*

And the prince went like this: "I hide you, Alexander, like an ostrich hiding its head under its wing" ...

Personally, however, I would have deciphered it shorter: "Alexander disappeared like an ostrich" ... Or: "Alexander pretended to be an ostrich.

Looks like the truth!

But that's not all...

Baryatinsky gave me a valuable indication, without knowing it himself ... Having found a reference in Dahl to the Old Testament "Book of the Prophet Isaiah", he was not too lazy to study it and find out that the "strufian" is present in verse 21 of chapter 13 ... and brought Dahl.

The prince was satisfied with this search and stopped there.

And I went further, asking the question: "Why did the elder choose this particular verse for this particular chapters?

The 13th chapter of Isaiah contains a prophecy about Babylon and that Babylon will be overthrown... In the modern Russian Bible, verse 21 looks like this: owls ("sirin" is both a fabulous siren bird with a female face and chest, and a kind of owl. - S.K.); and ostriches will dwell, and the shaggy ones will gallop there."

Dahl cited the verse truncated, in the "Dictionary of the Old Russian Language" by Izmail Ivanovich Sreznevsky the same (!) verse is given in full (with the word "sirin"), but in a slightly different edition ...

All things considered, it seems to me that the most accurate modern translation is: "And they will settle there beasts, and the houses will be filled with their voices, and Sirins and ostriches will dwell there, and the demons will return there."

And this is verse 21 of the 13th chapter...

But why exactly these numbers?

And this is the conjecture, thanks to Baryatinsky's hint, that I finally came to ...

Until November 19, 1925, Alexander read and knew the Bible ... Having moved away from the hustle and bustle in the image of Kuzmich (and I personally am now sure of this), he already had more than enough time for the deepest studies of the Bible ...

So, was he not once amazed, reading Isaiah once again, by a number of amazing coincidences?

It was in chapter number 13, that is, under a magical, full of mystic number, that the fall of Babylon was spoken of, which Alexander could not but look like - especially in his new capacity - the Anglo-Saxon West ... Actually, even phonetically "Babylon" ("Babilon") and Albion is very similar...

And in this prophetic chapter for Alexander, under the number of the day he signed the Decree on the privileges of the RAC and the secret rules for the RAC, there was a prophetic verse for Alexander, marked with the numbers of the year of adoption of both this and another main, but, alas, not executed his Decree - "American" Decree on the Bering Sea ...

Its implementation by the West-Babylon was thwarted ...

And in the same 21st verse, it was said about the future triumph over Babylon of the ostrich, with which Alexander, in his new capacity, could not but identify himself ...

But Alexander, even when he was king, was full of mystical feelings and ideas!

If he were simply comparing himself to an ostrich, then The Secret would most likely contain this or a similar form of the word. The biblical form "strufian" hinted at the corresponding place Bibles...

And this place already hinted at the pain that Russian America left in the soul of the former emperor ...

MAYBE the skeptical reader will just shrug their shoulders after reading this...

However, the author wants to believe in just such an explanation of the "Secrets" of "Fyodor Kuzmich" ...

Chapter 7

Kondraty Ryleev, Nikolai Romanov, Count Nesselrode and others ...

ALEXANDER either went into the skete or into oblivion. And on the Russian throne was the youngest of the sons of Paul - Nikolai, with a living middle brother Konstantin, the actual governor in Warsaw ("technical", so to speak, the governor was then Prince Joseph Zayonchek) ...

The refusal of the middle brother from the throne in favor of the younger one and the decision of the emperor in his favor were, in fact, a state secret. This is how the Emperor himself set things up. And since almost everyone was sure that Konstantin Pavlovich, and not Nikolai Pavlovich, should succeed Alexander Pavlovich, at the end of 1825 something like an interregnum was established in Russia

And the hitch here was not only, and not so much in the morganatic marriage of Konstantin with Pani Grudzinskaya (Princess Lovich), but in the fact that both Grand Dukes had strong supporters. In the highest circles, two "parties" were formed. The court, the nobility were in the majority for Nicholas. The army and especially the guard supported Constantine.

By the way, it is little known, but Count Arakcheev also "put" on Konstantin.

And he's not alone...

What is the palace guards coup in Russia, Nikolai knew well. He also knew the character of his elder brothers... You take the throne "out of line" - even with the consent and even at the request of Konstantin, and then he suddenly changes his mind, and the guard is unhappy, and even with Alexander it is not clear whether he died, or unusual thus renounced, but alive ...

And the rest...

Nesselrode, for example, hastened to send a circular note dated November 27 (December 9) to the Russian embassies stating that after receiving the news of the death of Alexander I in Taganrog (just in the morning of November 27), Grand Duke Nikolai Pavlovich, followed by members of the imperial family, Ministers and members of the State Council swore allegiance to Emperor Constantine I.

Immediately after the oath in an emergency meeting of the State Council (for some reason it met only after the oath, and not before), a package is opened with Alexander's manifesto of August 16, 1823 on the appointment of Nicholas as heir to the throne. Here, again, everything happens contrary to the direct instructions of Alexander to open the package in case of notification of his death before any other actions.

Silent scene... But it is violated by the military governor of St. Petersburg Miloradovich, declaring that the job is done, Nikolai swore allegiance to Konstantin... And the "sworn" wave soon reaches the capital's military units and ministries!

The brothers start a correspondence, mutually yielding to each other ... Meanwhile, confusion is growing.

And the story with the famous (but by no means famous in real time) "Konstantinovsky" ruble! Everything agrees that this mysterious silver ruble with the inscription "B.M. KONSTANTIN I IMP. AND SAM. ALL-RUSSIAN.» around a profile portrait of a bald man with thick, "fierce" eyebrows and stubbornly compressed lips was really minted at the St. Petersburg Mint on the secret instructions of Kankrin ...

destroyed both stamps and trial rubles (almost all) ... But they were preparing their issue and minted them up to accession.

It was not easy, it was not easy for Nikolai then ... He was then almost thirty years old, he was a prominent guy, but, apparently, even then there was something in him that did not dispose sensible generals from the future Decembrist environment to attempts to get closer to him. Indeed, in principle, it would have been wiser for the conspirators to bet on the younger Grand Duke ... So what if only a few knew about the abdication of Constantine and Alexander's decision in favor of Nicholas!

The morganatic marriage was in full view. And this was a serious reason for the supporters of deep reforms to make the "impeccable" Grand Duke their banner (without even notifying him about it) ...

But no!

One way or another, Nikolay received a reply from his brother from Warsaw with a decisive refusal on December 12 (24), and on the same day a strictly secret letter arrived from Taganrog from the Chief of the General Staff Dibich with news of the impending "terrible conspiracy" and the impending "revolt".

It was necessary to decide, and without five minutes (or rather, without two days), the emperor decides. On December 12, he signs his first manifesto on accession to the throne and orders "the time of accession to be counted from November 19 (December 1), 1825" ... On December 14, a re-swearing is appointed.

On the same December 12, Nikolai sent a note to Dibich, where he wrote: *"The determined courier has returned (from Warsaw. - S.K.); the day after tomorrow in the morning I - either the sovereign, or - without breathing ... I will send you the day after tomorrow, if I am alive, I myself don't know who yet - with a notification how everything went down.*

The state of mind of the future king is evidenced not only by the style of the note, but also by the very fact of its writing and sending. Well, it would seem, wait two days and write already as a "sovereign." But on the eve of decisive events, Nikolai wrote not so much to Dibich as he wanted to somehow pour out his soul, at least to the absent trusted person.

And so the day of December 14 passed, the "rebellion" occurred and was suppressed, the "terrible conspiracy" was uncovered and investigation started...

And HERE the Russian "American" cause was unlucky again - already at the very beginning of the reign of the new emperor. The Decembrist circles turned out to be too firmly connected in one way or another with the ideas of our strengthening in Russian America, and directly with the RAC.

Suffice it to say that in house number 72 on the Moika, where since 1824 the Main Board of the Company was located, Kondraty Ryleev lived in a service apartment, since 1824 he was the ruler of the office of the RAC. And it was in house number 72 that meetings of members of the Northern Society were often held.

And after December 14, any public phenomenon and any public figure, at least somehow involved in the speech of the Decembrists, to the most favored nation treatment of the Russian the emperor could not count.

The December 14 uprising itself actually happened in such a way that descendants can only shrug their shoulders about it, but potentially it was far from being as insignificant and ridiculous as it might seem at first glance.

In the diary of Alexander Ivanovich Turgenev, historian, archeographer, director of the Department of Religious Affairs of Foreign Confessions, for the years 1836-1837 there are two almost identical entries - from December 15 and January 9, about some piquant circumstance ...

On January 9, 1837, the fifty-three-year-old Turgenev wrote: "I went to Pushkin ... Then he was with me and we looked at the French papers and chattered until 4 o'clock. Yermol. Eagle. Kisel. (in the entry dated December 15, "Prince Mensch" will also be mentioned. - S.K.) everyone knew and expected: things would not work without us ... "

"Yermol." - this is the famous "Caucasian" Yermolov ... Hero of the Patriotic War of 1812, General from infantry...

"Kisel." - this is Count Pavel Dmitrievich Kiselev, who conducted the first investigation of the conspiracy, and already under Nicholas - the author of the "Kiselev reform" on the management of state peasants, a supporter of the abolition of serfdom...

"Eagle." - this is Major General Mikhail Fedorovich Orlov, who accepted the surrender of Paris, - the most senior, perhaps, the Decembrist, punished "slightly" ... "Prince. Mensch." - this is His Serene Highness Prince Alexander Sergeevich Menshikov, the great-grandson of Petrovsky "Danilych", the future commander-in-chief in the Crimean War ...

That's who "knew", "expected" and believed that without him "things would not work ...".

No, everything was not so simple in the speech of the Decembrists.

Digressing (although perhaps not very much) from the topic, I will say that, in my opinion, this phenomenon of Russian history has not been studied to this day, despite a number of supposedly "classical" works. In my research, the theme of the Decembrists appeared in a natural way - insofar as it turned out that it was directly related to the theme of Russian America, and the theme of the Far East ... And further I will talk about this connection and its influence on the fate of the RAC under Nicholas ... However, in I'll tell the reader in parentheses that, for example, the Austrian-Bohemian Count Karl Joseph Klammer-Martinitz (Nepomuk), who was Metternich's confidant and accompanied Archduke Ferdinand d'Este on his mission to St. Petersburg in 1825, submitted a number of notes to Metternich about the events of December 14, and among them one with such a name, for one for which I personally take off my hat to this count (which, however, I never wear), - "Note on the state of public opinion regarding the events of December 1825. A statement of the moral and political significance of these events and their connection with the internal situation of the Russian Empire "...

And there Martinitz wrote: *"The conspirators were inept and cowardly in their deeds, but their projects were of such a kind that the success of the first step would prove in practice the correctness of their calculations in the most fruitful way. Bestuzhev told the generals, who blasphemed him on the 15th (27th) in the emperor's waiting room: "We started the uprising two hours later, that's the whole mistake; otherwise you would all be on your knees before us..."*

And Nikolai knew this and understood it perfectly! Therefore, everything on which the reflection of the December fire lay was he personally feels uncomfortable...

Well, how could he agree with the ideas and plans for strengthening state support for the RAC, if they put forward by the Decembrists Ryleev, Zavalishin?

And it was actually possible to step over oneself, and it was necessary. After all, the logic of the creative development of the state was on the side of the Decembrists ... Already at the end of his reign, Nicholas somehow escaped - but not in front of everyone, but in the diary:

Still would! He could hear the truth (and he heard it), getting acquainted with the documents of the Decembrists and their testimony ... After all, the same "Russian Truth" by Pestel provided more than enough information for reflection. And the Decembrists turned out to be only the visible part of the iceberg of discontent and the desire to act. And this iceberg was quite impressive in its "non-Decembrist", invisible part.

At the same time, both the Decembrists and the near-Decembrist circles were - for the most part - not

relaxed dreamers. These were guards and army officers, that is, people accustomed to weapons. People who, under the emperor-reformer, are able to approve the ideas and practice of reforms - if necessary - by force of arms!

The new emperor could rely on them reliably - as in his time not on a well-born the boyars, and the Great Peter leaned on energetic service people ... And before him - Ivan the Terrible.

The highest forgiveness and invitation of the Decembrists to cooperate instead of executions and hard labor - this would be just that "shock therapy" that would have shaken up the entire Russian society of that time in the most beneficial way.

And the naval part of the Decembrist movement could give a completely different look to the Russian prospects in America...

Alas, Nicholas the First, unlike Peter the Great, could not and did not want to become Nicholas the Great ... Instead of Russian Truth, he himself chose the Flattery and Lies of Nesselrods and high-ranking freaks ...

About the DECEMBERISTS - "Americans" and those who had a connection both with them and with Russian America, it is necessary tell in particular.

And you need to start, perhaps, with Lieutenant Zavalishin ...

I have already mentioned him - as a tireless detractor of Count Muravyov-Amursky. But the unfortunate fact of Zavalishin's stubborn rejection of Muravyov's merits cannot underestimate the scale of Zavalishin's personality.

Dmitry Irinarkhovich Zavalishin, the son of Suvorov's junior associate, chief of the Astrakhan garrison regiment Irinarkh Ivanovich Zavalishin, was born in 1804, died in 1892 (and in 1882 his last daughter Ekaterina was born!). He lived, as we see, for a long time, although at the age of twenty-two he was sentenced to death, which was replaced by hard labor.

During his short life until December 14, 1825, he managed so much that it is difficult to believe in it. Actually - almost impossible ... After graduating from the Naval Cadet Corps in 1819, he remained there to teach astronomy, higher mathematics, mechanics, higher theory of naval art, naval tactics and, as the Russian Biographical Dictionary reports, "other (! - S.K.) subjects."

Already teaching at the Naval Corps, he listened to lectures at the University, in the Mining Corps and at the Medical and Surgical Academy. He studied the languages English, German, French, Italian, Spanish, Polish, Latin, Greek and even Hebrew (translating the Bible from the original only "for his own understanding") ... He had extensive knowledge of literature and followed everything new in it

and in science.

As far as I can imagine, the midshipman-teacher did not suffer from special modesty, however, he had an uncommon nature and activity of thought ... He was clearly stubborn and, moreover, had "punching" abilities.

In August 1822, Zavalishin leaves on Lazarev's "Cruiser" for a round-the-world trip, but upon arrival in Russian America in 1824 from Baranov Island, he recalls to St. Petersburg in May and "closes the round the world" by land - through Siberia ... He was recalled by order of the emperor Zavalishin in the fall of 1822 wrote a letter from London with a project to organize a certain "Order of Restoration".

However, after Russian America, Sith, Novo-Arkhangelsk, Fort Ross, the young erudite also has other - much more practical and sensible thoughts. They are also enriched with Siberian impressions. On the trip, Lieutenant Zavalishin gets acquainted with all the figures of Siberia, with industrialists, and upon arrival in the capital on November 3, 1824, he also presents Alexander a note about

the annexation of California, the occupation of Amur and the development of the fleet.

Zavalishin's proposals were by no means thought out in everything, but they had a good grasp of the young Bonaparte: they say, you must first get involved in the battle, and then it will be clear ... And a certain excess of selectivity in the character of an enthusiast could only serve the Russian cause. In faraway Russian and non-Russian America, being impudent turned out to be a winning proposition most often ... Of course, if, in addition to impudence, there was also industriousness. However, Zavalishin also has diligence.

enough...

Zavalishin believed that we needed to support the San Francisco zone from the north, descending to the south to 42 ° northern latitude!

A committee chaired by Arakcheev studied his notes, consisting of Admirals Shishkov and Mordvinov, and also Nesselrode.

Then the story begins not quite clear. According to the project of the order, Admiral Shishkov on December 3, 1824, informed the author of the idea that the emperor found it "fascinating, but intractable" ... Most likely, the mission of Shishkov, the Minister of Public Education and the head of the department of foreign confessions, ended there.

But what about Russian America? Alas, we already know that things were going on with her in Russia in general by that time. things were not fun ... Mordvinov supported Zavalishin, Nesselrode objected no less strongly ...

The sources are silent about the position of Arakcheev, but there are so many lies around Count Alexei Andreevich that there is nothing to be surprised at. The very silence of historians allows me to assume that he did not say a hard "no". Count Arakcheev was a man of a fairly broad mind. And, although historians have a reputation for persecuting the fleet, Russian sailors, after all, twice put his name on the sea maps of the world. In 1817, Kotzebue discovered Arakcheev Atoll, and Bellingshausen discovered Arakcheev Island in 1820. But the Russian ocean sailors did not know how to fawn, and the count did not like flattery, but the accuracy of the execution of the order.

But even if Arakcheev was on the side of the lieutenant, this would not change anything ... On the note dated November 3, 1824, there was a black shadow of the Convention of April 5, 1824, and soon the Anglo-Russian Convention of February 1825 would completely cross out this note.

Zavalishin is disappointed, but the owner of Fort Ross, RAK, still remains. The directors of the Company get acquainted with his thoughts and become interested in them. They start making plans. At the same time, at the end of 1824, according to some sources, Ryleev attracted him to the Northern Society ...

However, here the story is also muddy ... And the later "Memoirs" of Zavalishin himself do not clarify everything - confirming only the fact of extensive contacts between the young lieutenant and Ryleev, as well as the general awareness of the first about the plans of a secret society, one of the leaders of which was the second.

Zavalishin was not in St. Petersburg on December 14, 1825, was arrested in Simbirsk on December 30, taken to the capital, interrogated and released on January 18, 1826. And on March 2, he was arrested again ...

In fact, the arrest in itself in the "December 14 case" was not yet a civil death. Here is Alexander Sergeevich Griboedov, known to all of us ... Arrested on January 21, 1826 in Grozny, brought by courier to the capital to the main guardhouse on February 11, released only on June 2. But how! By the highest order, he was released with an acquittal certificate, with promotion to the next rank and issuance not against the annual salary! Not always, apparently, from the mind - grief ...

But any arrest caused at first, of course, panic. Much later, in his memoirs, Dmitry

Irinarkhovich recalled: "Director Prokofiev, out of fear after December 14, burned all the papers, wherever my name was mentioned, and not just those that came personally from me.

However, the stubborn Zavalishin managed to send a letter to Nikolai on January 24 (February 5), 1826, where there were such lines: *"California, succumbing to Russia and populated by Russians, would remain forever in its power. The acquisition of its harbors and the cheapness of maintenance would make it possible to have an observation fleet there, which would give Russia dominion over the Pacific Ocean and Chinese trade, would strengthen the possession of other colonies, would limit the influence of the United States.*

Looking ahead, I note that if the ideas of Zavalishin (who developed the ideas of Petrine, Lomonosov, Shelikhov, Rezanov, Baranov!) had become a real state line, then by the end of the 19th century Russia would have had almost no problems in the Pacific Ocean and would not it would be to look for ice-free harbors for the Russian fleet either in the Japanese Nagasaki, or in the unlucky Russian Port Arthur on Chinese soil ...

But this is so far - by the way ...

But further on, my dear reader, I am again forced not to assert something, but to assume ... That's what happens, that's what a discrepancy turns out. The professor, and now academician Bolkhovitinov, citing in 1990 the above quoted passage from a letter dated January 24 (February 5), 1926, reports that Zavalishin wrote it already in prison.

But, I remind you: Lieutenant Zavalishin was released from arrest on January 18, and for the second time he was arrested at the duty general of the Main Staff only on March 2 and until April 4 was kept at the General Staff, and only then was transferred to the Peter and Paul Fortress.

And this information, in my opinion, is trustworthy, because it was taken from the thorough biographical guide "Decembrists", published by the Nauka publishing house in 1988, edited by Academician Nechkina.

So why is there a disparity? -

And I became wary, because I have long been inclined to treat such "little things" carefully ...

If the letter was written on January 24, then it was not written in prison, but outside. But why did someone have to cast a shadow on a clear day and present the matter in such a way that the letter left the prison? As for Bolkhovitinov, it must be assumed that some old source let him down. But why is this ancient source lied?

After all, if such a letter (a potential "bomb" for the future dominion of the United States) was written by Zavalishin in the wild, then does not the secret of the second arrest lie in it, in this "Californian" letter?

After all, the stubborn Zavalishin in the wild interfered with all sorts of non-selrods and freaks more than strongly!

Yes, in fact, already later - when Zavalishin's Memories themselves were at my disposal - I learned from them that immediately after Zavalishin was brought from Simbirsk to the Winter Palace, Nikolai himself received him in the evening and told the arrested person: "I heard a lot good about you. I hope that there will be no shortage of opportunities to use your abilities to good use ... Set out your ideas about the fleet and on other subjects that you find necessary, and tomorrow present your note to me personally in six o'clock pm"...

And soon Zavalishin was released from custody. And he had an unexpected real chance for real government roles. The new arrest crossed everything out - forever.

Alas, it is unlikely that any research will now give an accurate answer to the question: "What played into the arrest and

severe condemnation of Zavalishin, the decisive role is his very indirect involvement in the movement or the intrigues of those who were afraid of the influence of Zavalishin's ideas and his potential state significance?"

YES, the EXACT answer was hardly known even to such a major expert on the problem as the late academician Nechkina ... But here is additional information for reflection ... In the reference book "Decembrists" I mentioned, the "Alphabet for members of former malicious secret societies and persons involved in the case" was also published, produced by the Highest approved on December 17, 1825, the Investigative Commission, compiled in 1827 by the ruler of the affairs of the Investigative Committee A.D. Borovkov.

This "Alphabet ..." contains the names of the Lvov brothers (both were released on February 21, 1826 from certificate). I will give - in full - a reference to the second of them (the first is about the same thing, but more sparingly):

“**LVOV 2nd** Vasily Fedorov. Lieutenant of the Life Guards of the Izmailovsky Regiment.

In the testimony of midshipman Divov, among other things, it was mentioned that on the eve of December 14, in his and Belyaev's apartment, lieutenant of the Izmailovsky regiment Gudim told what he had heard from Lvov and his brother, the above-mentioned, supposedly a member of the State Council of the Mordvins, leaving the house of their father, the Lvovs, in Palace for the oath to Emperor Nikolai Pavlovich, said: "maybe I won't return, because I decided to oppose this election until the end of my life," and turning to the children of Lvov (these two brothers), he said: "Now you must act." The Belyaevs confirmed this word for word. Gudim, interrogated by the Commission, after a long denial admitted that he had said the above and heard it from the Lvovs. But the Lvovs, who, by order of His Highness, were summoned to the Commission on February 24, both during interrogation and at face-to-face confrontations with Gudim, rejected this testimony, arguing that they themselves had not even heard anything like that and had not been told to him, and that Admiral Mordvinov had never been with their father between November 27th and December 14th.

The commission left this without attention, and both Lvovs were released at the same time.

This episode is very strange. The Lvov brothers were clearly not lying. And this is not proved by their acquittal certificate, and not so much by the fact that they were able to refute the claims of Gudim and Belyaevs at three (!) confrontations in extreme conditions, but by the way they denied **everything**.

They could state that Mordvinov had not been in their father's house for more than a crescent at all, only if Mordvinov really had not been to them during this period ... After all, it was very easy to find out the truth - dignitaries like Mordvinov live in houses with glass walls and visit they are in the same houses (the Lvovs' father was the director of the court choir)...

Interrogation of the servants - and that's it, Lvov 1st and Lvov 2nd "burned down"! Unless, of course, they're just stupid twisted instead of telling the truth.

It turns out that Divov, Belyaev and Gudim lied ...

But why and why?

The twenty-year-old midshipmen of the Guards crew Divov and Belyaev clearly did not belong to the Northern secret society. They were members of the secret "Society of the Guards Crew", but they were on Senate Square, and on December 15 they were arrested in the barracks of the crew by Feldzekhmeister General Grand Duke Mikhail Pavlovich (which is also somewhat strange) ...

And just Divov and the Belyaev brothers showed not only Mordvinov, but also Zavalishin.

The Belyaevs were from small estate nobles, but they spun, as they say, "with the nobility" ... Father, a retired collegiate adviser, managing the estates of Count A.K. Razumovsky in the Penza and Ryazan provinces, was a freemason, a friend of Alexander Labzin, a real state counselor,

the largest Russian Freemason at the turn of the 18th-19th centuries, and Joseph Pozdeev, the head of the office of Count Z.G. Chernyshev and the head of Russian masons at the beginning of the 19th century. Son, Alexander Belyaev (he was two years older than his brother Peter), from the age of 10 he lived in St. Petersburg in the family of Prince V.V. Dolgoruky (also a Freemason) ...

The Belyaevs were connected with Dmitry Irinarkhovich - he accepted them into his own, founded, after all, a small and symbolic "Order of the Restoration" ... But there was no particular sin in that.

However, judging by Borovkov's "Alphabet ...", it was the testimony of three midshipmen that decided the fate of Zavalishin, who denied his guilt (and almost all real Decembrists admitted it even with some haste).

The fates of this trinity turned out to be similar ...

Divov was sentenced in the 1st category to eternal hard labor, but instead of hard labor he was sent to prison companies in Bobruisk without a term, but with increasing indulgence, in 1835 he was transferred as a private to the Black Sea Line Battalion, then to the Caucasus, where he died in a skirmish with the highlanders in 1841 year.

The Belyaev brothers were sentenced in the higher category IV to 12 years of hard labor with an immediate reduction of the term to 8 years and with the easing of the serf regime; sent to Siberia in 1827; in 1832 they were released from work; in 1839 they were assigned to the Kabardian Jaeger Regiment; in 1844 they were promoted to warrant officers, retired and lived quietly: one - up to sixty, and the other - even before the age of eighty-four...

In fairness, I note that the mitigation of the sentence over the years was characteristic of the fate most of the Decembrists, but the midshipmen began to be "pitied" almost immediately.

As for Gudim, although he had nothing to do with the movement, he spent four months under arrest in the regiment, and then with the same rank was transferred to the army regiment in Derbent, where he died in 1828 ...

Why did Divov and the Belyaev brothers try to slander Mordvinov?

Is it because Mordvinov was a major figure, for many internal and external "Nesselrodov" - extremely inconvenient? Inconvenient, including because of his attitude to RAC ...

And didn't they also slander Zavalishin?

Break the young midshipmen (and the Decembrists - I don't know why, but for the most part they behaved far not worthy) it was not so difficult ... To intimidate, break, then promise indulgence ...

I don't know, I don't know if I'm right ... But there are grounds for suspicion here - as in many other cases with RAK - available.

It was not easy then for Count Nikolai Semenovich Mordvinov ... He was associated with many of those who was preparing a speech on Senate Square, for a long time and visibly!

For example, in the ode "Civil Courage" dedicated to Mordvinov, which was not uncensored and distributed in the lists, the future state criminal of the 1st category Ryleev in 1823 exclaimed:

But should we lose heart, When
still in our native country, One of
Catherine's wondrous giants of glorious days, Mordvinov is awake
in the council among a host of chosen
husbands? Thank heavens for their holy
indulgence!

From them, for the good of the Russian
countries, a virtuous man was given to us ...

By the way, in the same 1823, Nikolai Semenovitch was awarded the highest Russian order
Andrew the First-Called (and he had both "Anna", and "Vladimir", and "Alexander Nevsky" of the first degrees).

President of the Free Economic Society, he advocated the development of industry and the introduction of scientific and
technological achievements, insisted on financial and credit support for domestic entrepreneurs, wrote works on economics and
banking, on agriculture ...

In 1825, Ryleev dedicated a separate edition of his famous Doots to Mordvinov. One of them, by the way, began like this:
"A storm roared, the rain rustled, lightning flew in the darkness ..." There were also such lines in it: "Yermak sat on the wild bank
of the Irtysh, enveloped in thought

Many Decembrists saw Mordvinov in the future government.

Mordvinov, on the other hand, turned out to be the only member of the State Council and the Supreme Criminal Court who
refused to sign the death warrant for the five main - "out of ranks" - "criminals" (hanged, by the way, for some reason on the day
of July 13, 1826).

And Mordvinov was at that time the most significant and influential guardian of the prospects of Russian
America.

But Tsar Nicholas was even more hostile towards her ...

The prominent "American" Vasily Golovnin was close to the DECABRISTS, in 1825 he was captain commander, managing
the executive expedition of the Admiralty Colleges with the rank of quartermaster general of the fleet. Under him, as an officer
for special assignments, was the Decembrist midshipman Feopemt Lutkovsky, who twice "circumnavigated the world" went on
his first voyage to Russian America with Golovnin,
having fourteen years of age.

In 1824, Vasily Mikhailovich wrote a "Note on the state of the Russian fleet in 1824" (it was published after his death, in
1861 under the name of midshipman Morekhodov). He was always rightly critical, but even this did not strengthen the "Russian-
American" credit of the new
Russian emperor.

The Decembrist was a member of the Antarctic expedition, adjutant of the Chief of the Naval Staff, Lieutenant Commander
Konstantin Petrovich Torson, a member of the Commission established at his suggestion for compiling estimates for the
construction of ships, frigates and other vessels ... Bellingshausen named an island in Antarctica after him, renamed after
condemnation Thorson in 1826 to High Island...

The Decembrist was Lieutenant of the Guards crew Anton Petrovich Arbuzov, a relative of one of
Lisyansky's associates in circumnavigating the world on the Neva, Lieutenant Pavel Arbuzov ...

And Baron Steingel, already familiar to us!

The researcher of Russian America, the ruler of the Novo-Arkhangelsk office of the RAC from 1818 to 1832, since 1835 -
one of the directors of the RAC, Kirill Timofeevich Khlebnikov got into the investigation papers simply as one of Zavalishin's
addressees and "was ignored." Thus, his name was associated with the Decembrist movement very, very weakly, but - as in that
joke, not everyone could always remember - "either he, or him ...". But Khlebnikov and RAK were obvious "twin brothers" for
everyone ...

And all this, already at the very beginning of the new reign, corroded the bonds of the RAC building, promising in the future

crash...

The modern biographer of Nikolai, Leonid Vyskochkov, paid little attention to Nikolai's attitude towards RAC, but it's good that he did not bypass this issue, while correctly noting that the tsar's attitude was restrained.

Quite correctly (albeit in passing) the reason for this restraint was also indicated - disagreement with views of the Decembrists on the prospects for trade and economic expansion in the Pacific Ocean.

True, the Decembrists had in mind not so much economic expansion as a reasonable geopolitical perspective. Yes, and in describing the activities of the RAC, Nikolai's biographer was far from being correct in everything ("... the organization of the fur trade was of a predatory nature and was sometimes accompanied by cruelty towards the local population ..."), but the history of the RAC in Russia is already being distorted in general.

a long time ago, and the honest attempts of some provincial historians to give a true picture are suppressed, as

I guess, historians of the capital.

But, anyway, in 1826, not only Russia and not only only the supreme power of Russia, that is, the tsar-autocrat. The fate of the Russian-American Company also came to its crossroads ...

Writers Alexander Alexandrovich Bestuzhev (Marlinsky) and Orest Mikhailovich Somov lived in the ONE house with Ryleev (that is, in the house of the RAC board). Bestuzhev was unequivocally a Decembrist, Somov, the clerk in the RAC board, was familiar with many Decembrists. He was arrested, but already on January 7, 1826, he was released by the highest command with a certificate of acquittal. However, when he was released, Nikolai threw a characteristic remark: "That's a good company you got there" ...

And this short, casually thrown phrase was, in some respects, a psychological verdict on RAC by the new emperor. The same phrase doomed the entire Nikolaev Russian America to progressive vegetation.

And this also programmed the future second-rateness of all subsequent Russian Far Eastern policy, with all the potential not only of its first-rateness for the future of the state, but of fatefulness ...

In NON-RUSSIAN America - in the USA, the highest figure of visible government in 1826, too changed. Our old friend Adams became President.

Letters of notice on the accession to the throne were signed

Nicholas on December 19 (31), 1825 and through 19 Russian representatives sent to 54 addresses, in including the President of the United States.

At the beginning of American April 1826, the Charge d'Affaires of Russia in the USA, Franz Maltitz, informed Nesselrode that he had handed the letter to Secretary of State Clay, and on April 20, Adams wrote a letter in response, clearly going beyond the purely protocol framework ...

Well - and so on

IN REALLY, a process begins in the history of Russian America, which can be characterized in two words: "progressive decline" ... Sadly punning, we can say that the era of Baranov is beginning to be replaced by an era of royal and noble rams.

Here we will talk about it further ...

I have already had occasion to mention the Russian geopolitics Alexei Vandam. In 1912, Suvorin's printing house published his interesting work "Our Position" ... Aleksey Efimovich was surprisingly perspicacious in his geopolitical assessments (although, alas, he was seriously

political). And after much deliberation, I decided to continue my story about Russian America with several extensive quotations from this work of his.

On the one hand, the reader thus gets the opportunity to make sure that the author is not alone in his view of the problem, that smart Russian people are talking about the problems we are considering.

thought about three hundred, and two hundred, and a hundred years ago ...

On the other hand, I do not deny myself the pleasure of introducing the reader to the thoughts and style of the original, but almost forgotten Russian thinker...

On the third hand, I, citing an opinion "from the side", simultaneously advance in my narrative and chronologically, finally going beyond the 20s of the XIX century.

Vandamme gave a largely brilliant overview of "our position" across the entire geopolitical spectrum, and even where he messed up something, actually or ideologically, he is more right and interesting than the compilers of banal copybooks ...

About Russian America and the lost prospects in the Pacific, he said everything exactly. Vandamme qualified Baranov as a "giant" and wrote: *"With the departure of this great man, the heroic period of Russian activity in the Pacific Ocean ended and the Russians, advancing overseas with the same courage with which the Dutch, Spaniards and French advanced in their time, like them had to retreat before the Anglo-Saxons."*

Vandamme also remembers Shelikhov and writes; *"The plan he worked out to fight foreigners was as follows: to unite all Russian industrialists into one powerful company; spread Russian possessions on the northwestern coast of America, which belonged to no one, from the Bering Strait to Spanish California; establish trade relations with Manila, Canton, Boston and New York. Finally, putting all these enterprises under the protection of the government, to arrange an arsenal and a station for the Russian fleet in the Hawaiian Islands, which, protecting Russian interests and having an extensive and versatile practice in the Pacific Ocean, could develop into the first fleet in the world."*

We, dear reader, already know that the grandiosity of these plans of Shelikhov did not even inspire Alexandra, and even Nikolai, even more so, did not think on such a scale,

But Vandamme, in his opinion that only the Pacific Ocean could give us the first fleet in the world, was absolutely right!

After Russia's access to its natural western maritime boundaries - to the shores of the Baltic, the Baltic Fleet could not have serious strategic tasks. The coastal batteries of the islands of Ezel and Dago, the forts of Kronstadt - that's what now guarded the peace of Russia in the Baltic ..

On the Black Sea, the fleet was blocked by the straits, and all the successes of Russia in reaching the Caucasian borders were ensured by actions on land. And Sevastopol became a powerful defensive (but - nothing more!) and protective Black Sea bastion.

The Northern Seas did not need a navy - it was necessary to develop an icebreaking and merchant fleet there.

But in the Far East, Russia has first-class prospects by the first third of the century before last without there could not be a first-class fleet.

With a simple timely transfer of a dozen or two Russian warships from the Baltic and the Black Sea (with their exit, somewhat extended in time) to the Fort Ross zone, Russia would irreversibly change the situation in the Russian zone of the Pacific Ocean in its favor. Pair of caravans of transport ships with specific

peasant settlers and everything necessary for settling in California, would complete the job and provide the project with a food and economic base.

Having missed Hawaii, it was still not too late to recoup in California!

Reality gave a different ... Speaking of this, Vandam mentioned, of course, both the Decree of September 4, 1821, and the Monroe Doctrine ("*... small, just peeking into the world of S.-A. United States (ek, how exactly! - S.K.) through the mouth of President Monroe they loudly announced to the whole world that they look at the American mainland opened by the Spaniards, French and Russians as their property ...*").

Further, he - not quite, as the reader will see, exactly in fact, but absolutely accurately in a systemic sense, describes the situation with the conventions: *demanding from Russia the delimitation of possessions.*

The result of the negotiations that arose was an extremely important convention, signed on the same day, February 16, 1825, with both England and S.-A. The United States (Vandam combines the two conventions into one, which is characteristic in itself - you can see, and then it was not easy to inquire about the details, even having understood the essence. - S.K.). Under this convention, concluded with one power, Russia carried its border westward from the Rocky Mountains to 142 degrees of Greenwich longitude. The northern half of the space we ceded was given by England to the Hudsonby Company, from which so-called British Columbia was formed. Delimitation with S.-A. The United States consisted in a simple refusal on our part of the lands that belonged to us, which now (in 1912. - S.K.) make up the richest northwestern states of Washington and Oregon. In general, according to the convention of February 16, 1825, of our possessions on the American mainland, only one third remained with us, known as Alaska, and two thirds were given to the Anglo-Saxons without any compensation from their

sides."

This is how Vandamme, an analyst of the Russian General Staff, described the events that the reader in this already read the book...

Here is how he described what followed:

"After the session of these lands, whose virgin forests abounded with fur-bearing animals, and coastal waters with sea beaver and fur seal, a very profitable fur trade, which until then was almost exclusively in Russian hands in all fur markets (then this was no longer the case, although all the most valuable furs went to the world market from Russian colonies, even if they were supplied to it by Anglo-Saxon poachers - S.K.), now began to pass to the British and Americans; clipped in the very bark by the narrowing of its fishing area. The Russian-American company was forced to gradually abolish its trading posts and reduce shipping, and Russia to withdraw to the base from which Bering began his explorations of the Pacific Ocean, i.e. to Kamchatka ... "

Yes, everything began to decline... On March 1, 1827, the department finally retired Mikhail Matveyevich Buldakov - the fourth figure in the history of the RAC after Shelikhov, Rezanov and Baranov. In recent years, aching, he often went to his estate in his native Veliky Ustyug, but did not leave his post in the RAC at the request of the shareholders.

Now he is gone, dying three years later in his homeland at the age of fifty-four.

And in RUSSIAN political life, Karl-Robert Nesselrode was becoming more and more established ...

The author of a popular but extremely superficial biography of Nikolai, Henri Troyat, laureate of the Goncourt Prize, in 2000 ranted about the fact that, "they say, from generation to generation, Russian

sovereigns are trying by means of war and diplomacy to gain access to sea routes through the Baltic and Black Seas, and that this expansion, which, they say, is needed like air by a huge country devoid of natural (!) borders, is accompanied by considerations about the greatness of Russia.

Completely denying Russia's natural borders, the Frenchman further argued that "a furious patriot" Nicholas looked at the future of the world through the prism of Russia.

Oh, if only it were so! But in fact, Nikolai increasingly looked at the future of Russia through glasses. Nesselrode...

The same Troyatt says about the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs that he, the son of a German Catholic from Westphalia and a Jewish woman who converted to Protestantism, was de "to the end devoted to her new homeland" ...

N-yes...

Nesselrode was more devoted to Metternich than even to Nicholas. What about devotion to Russia? If Nesselrode and Russia were connected by some word with the root "before", then this was not a word "loyalty", but "betrayal"!

Nesselrode stated that he was "only a simple instrument for carrying out orders and political plans of His Majesty", however, although he was an instrument, he was far from being a king ...

At the same time, just at the end of the twenties and the beginning of the thirties, Nikolai in matters of foreign policy turned out to be unambiguously not the leader (like Alexander), but the follower ... Followed by Nesselrode, who, in turn, was leading only for the tsar, being himself led by external anti-Russian forces.

Alexander carefully read all the diplomatic correspondence, and according to his notes it is noticeable that he was guided quite professionally even in details.

Nikolai also read the correspondence, but in the early years, as a rule, he simply recorded the fact familiarization with the dispatches and marked: "*Approved.*" And - nothing more.

At the helm was the "faithful" Karl.

Surprisingly, for example, the Soviet historian Vinogradov seriously wrote that "over the long years of service, Karl Vasilyevich learned to leave his opinion on the threshold of the imperial office." If anything is true here, it is the assertion that a miniature lover of good wines and food, ladies' society and music, had no opinion of his own. But it was not, because he was guided by the opinion of Metternich and K°, and, indeed, by *someone else*...

On July 29, 1826, still under Buldakov, the RAC turned to Nikolai, most dutifully announcing that after the entry into force of the Russian conventions with the Anglo-Saxons, the Company "is in such a distressed situation that it threatens not only for itself with the destruction of its existence, but for everything the local region with its perfect destruction.

I note that the literary style of this note was far from the former, determined by the hanged man. Ryleev.

And Nesselrode mockingly repeated that the conventions were beneficial to the RAC and that in ten years we would we can ban the Anglo-Saxons from fishing and trading.

In the meantime, the seals were exterminated, the Indians were soldered and slandered against the Russians. And Nesselrode was enthusiastically engaged in the cultivation of camellias in his country greenhouse - his collection of these extremely capricious flowers was extremely good.

Camellia can drop buds with a simple rearrangement from place to place, she is very picky

to temperature, lighting and air humidity, and great patience and caring attitude are required from flower growers.

He had enough soul for the camellia ...

Fedor Ivanovich Tyutchev, a subordinate of Nesselrode for many years, wrote about him in 1850:

No, my dwarf! Coward unparalleled! No
matter how tight you are and
don't be afraid, With your soul
of little faith You won't tempt Holy Rus'...

There are many feelings in these lines, but they do not correspond to the truth. And Nesselrode was not so cowardly, and He seduced Rus' more than once ...

Here is another assessment:

"The son of a Jewish woman who professed Protestantism and a German Catholic, a friend of the Encyclopedists, who changed citizenship five times, baptized according to the Anglican rite, born in Portugal and raised in Frankfurt and Berlin, who until the end of his life did not know how to speak and write correctly in Russian, Count Nesselrode was completely alien to the country whose national interests he was supposed to uphold for 40 years.

This quote is taken not from a monograph by a Soviet historian, but from a book by a historian already familiar to us. august - Grand Duke Nikolai Mikhailovich.

But why on earth did Nesselrode, this convinced cosmopolitan, endure so much, and not only endured, but trusted him with the most important state post?

No, the "dwarf" was not so weak ...

NESSELRODE became a leading figure in the Russian Foreign Ministry already in 1812 and was in charge of foreign policy Russia until 1856 (!) Years, all this time being in fact the Minister of Foreign Affairs in Russia.

Such a foreign policy "expert" as the French émigré Count "Yakov Osipovich" Lambert, who at the beginning of 1817 declared that Russia, due to its geographical position, was not destined for a large development of its naval forces, was gaining more and more weight.

In Nikolaev Russia, another foreigner also gained special influence - the Minister of Finance with 1823 to 1844 (he died in 1845) Kankrin.

To be honest, I was never able to understand such a complex figure in Russian history as a native of the Hessian city of Hanau, who became a count in Russia, Yegor Frantsevich Kankrin, the Russian Minister of Finance for twenty years.

I have already had to admit to the reader that the essence of a number of state figures of old Russia was unclear to me. And now Yegor Frantsevich - despite his alleged petitions for RAC - in this series also included, unfortunately.

However, I note that Count Mordvinov, known to us in the affairs of the RAC and the case of the Decembrists, was a principled opponent of Kankrin. Agreeing with him on the need to reduce the costs of the military department, on the introduction of silver currency and something else, he, as the Russian Biographical Dictionary edited by Polovtsev tells us, "condemned the general spirit of the Kankrin system - immobility, denial of public credit, drinking farming, tax system, keeping the budget secret, and, starting from 1828, wrote detailed criticisms of Kankrin's state paintings, proving that he was acting inappropriately.

Mordvinov did not use Nikolai's credit of trust, but Kankrin had an almost unlimited credit. Perhaps only he could prevent Nesselrode's disastrous line in Russian America. But here - did not interfere.

Well, Kankrin, perhaps, was sincerely mistaken - and in financial matters, in which in Tsarist Russia almost at all times the devil would have broken his leg (and if bankers like Stieglitz did not break it, then only for the simple reason that it was not the devil with them compete!), and in foreign policy affairs, coupled with the affairs foreign economic.

Nesselrode, on the other hand ... Nesselrode deliberately replaced the priorities of Russian foreign policy so that optimal long-term decisions were not made, but decisions were encouraged, for Russia disadvantageous.

And the atmosphere for such subtle and effective anti-Russian activities was then suitable.

SO, already at the beginning of the first "Nikolaev" year - 1826, the fifty-six-year-old (he died eighty-seven years old, in 1857) Baron Grigory Stroganov, a former envoy in Constantinople, sent a letter from Paris to the emperor on January 18, in which he "laid at the feet" the king "the fruits of reflections prompted by the most sincere devotion, devoid of any self-interest, any ulterior thought ...".

Everything is possible - maybe the baron had no back thoughts, but the essence of his letter-manifesto was very inopportune ... Stroganov called the tsar to the East, to help the Greeks, to fight for the holy faith against the Turks... And this meant expenses for Russia, blood, sweat. And all without any material reimbursement of these expenses and hard work.

Ensuring territorial increments within the framework of Russia's access to its natural (although denied by all sorts of troys of the century before last, past and present) southern borders?

It was a necessary thing. But it could be solved with much more modest costs, than those that Russia had to endure in her eastern wars of the 19th century ...

A part, only a part of the "Eastern" efforts and expenses devoted to Russian America, and her cause would be saved, firmly secured and successfully developed!

And instead, Russia is being drawn into a war for... the elimination of Turkey from the Balkans, from Greece! That is, using the expression of the memoirist Andrei Bolotov about the Seven Years' War, once again "weave into before nothing to do with her..."

Having begun in 1828, the war with Turkey brought Russian troops to the walls of Tsar-grad, to Constantinople ... Sultan Mahmud II was forced to start negotiations, and on September 2 (14), 1829, the Adrianople peace treaty was concluded.

As the 2nd TSB informs us, "the Greek question, which worried Europe for a long time, was in mainly resolved thanks to the success of Russian weapons.

But the success of a weapon always comes with a price of blood. According to the most conservative estimates, the independence of Greece cost the Russian people 10,000 men killed alone. And our acquisitions in the Caucasus, secured by the Peace of Adrianople, cost us less than a thousand people.

So, only 10 percent of the bloody Russian efforts were for the benefit of Russia. The remaining nine-tenths could not have been taken.

Fedor von der Pahlen actively participated in the conclusion of the Adrianople Peace. Obviously, thanks to him, in this world, the Black Sea was first opened to free American

shipping.

The British solved their European problems with our hands. But they solved their Pacific problems with their own hands, actively infiltrating China and preparing those opium wars that ensured the Anglo-French dominance in the Celestial Empire and in the Pacific Ocean.

Here I will give evidence of the results of the "civilizing mission" of the British, dating back to the end of the 80s of the XIX century: "Singapore. I wish that some jaded lady, drinking tea on the terrace of her beautiful estate in England, and complaining about the eternal absence of her husband Freddy, who is in the East, had the opportunity to look around Singapore and see the process of getting the money that buys her jewelry, toilets and villas... Chinatown... Every second house is an opium den... Depravity of the highest degree... Depravity in filth and filth, smell of decay, depravity of starving coolies who buy their opium from European millionaires... Naked nine-year-old girls sitting on the laps of lepers... And not far from this hell are the charming lawns of a luxurious British club, with gentlemen dressed all in white ... "

This, dear reader, is not an excerpt from the notes of a revolutionary. This is Grand Duke Alexander Mikhailovich, "Sandro", describes the impressions of his voyage in 1886 on the "Rynda" ...

The Anglo-Saxons got "tops" in Europe, they got them in Asia and the Far East ...

IN THE MEAN, time was slowly passing by, and the expiration date of the Convention on April 5, 1824 was approaching ...

On April 5, 1834, it expired. Russian America at that time was ruled by Ferdinand Petrovich Wrangel for the fourth year already ...

But first - about the Russian-American Treaty on Trade and Navigation, signed in St. Petersburg on December 6 (18), 1832.

Surprising but true. In Professor Bolkhovitinov's monograph "Russian-American Relations and the Sale of Alaska. 1834–1867", published by the publishing house "Nauka" in 1990, there is almost nothing about this agreement. True, as the author himself reports, it was discussed in his previous monograph, but at least a couple of paragraphs of such a serious thing as the 1832 treaty could have been devoted to ...

In 1999, the three-volume "History of Russian America. 1732–1867" edited by Academician Bolkhovitinov (I will talk about this interesting work in Chapter 11). So, there is no contract at all not a word!

But this treaty hit Russian America worse than the 1824 Convention! He declared trade and navigation "in the possessions of the parties" free and based on reciprocity (yes!). The inhabitants of both countries were allowed to trade wherever foreign trade was permitted. Trade could be on Russian and American ships.

And by the same treaty, the inhabitants of both countries were guaranteed the conduct of business and the same security as residents of the host country.

In short, why was it necessary to extend the Convention of April 5, 1824 in 1834, if there was treaty of 1832?! It was concluded until 1839, but was extended and remained in force until 1911 (!).

And all these years, he gave the Yankees legal grounds for robbing Russian wealth, bringing them to the northern the Pacific Ocean to no ...

And only after seventy-seven (!!) years - in 1911, the agreement was terminated by the American side on the grounds that its articles contradict the practice of Russia in relation to Jews - citizens of the United States,

former immigrants from Russia.

When we get to the time after the Russo-Japanese War, I will still remember the treaty of 1832 ...

And NOW we should return to Russian America, which is at the hand of Wrangel, but I still did not tell about a man, not to mention in this book is a sin ...

Actually, the reader could already remember the name of Vasily Mikhailovich Golovnin, but now we will get to know him better ... Very often a gloomy story about the gloomy times in Russian America is ahead of me, and, embarking on it, I want to stock up on faith in the strength and genius of the Russian people, in the final triumph of the Russian cause... And the story of Golovnin is capable of both surprising and encouraging!

He was born in 1776 into an old but poor noble family in the village of Gulyнки, Pronsky district, Ryazan province ... The places are the most overland. He was enrolled as a child in the Preobrazhensky Regiment, but, at the age of ten, orphaned, he "corresponded" to the Naval Cadet Corps.

That is, the sea was calling him even then, when he had not yet seen him in his eyes. And at the age of fourteen, he already fought as a midshipman in the Swedish war on a ship whose name, passed from one ship generation to another, always delighted me with purely Russian prowess without boasting - "Don't touch me" ... He was awarded a gold medal for courage and bravery .

As a young lieutenant, Golovnin cruises in the German Sea, off the coast of England and Holland. From 1802 to 1806 he served as a probationer-"volunteer" in the English fleet, sailed in the Mediterranean, off the coast of Africa, in the Atlantic and off the Antilles. He served under the command of Admirals Cornwells, Collingwood and Nelson himself, from whom he received thanks.

Upon his return from England, the thirty-year-old Golovnin compiled "Comparative remarks on the state of the English and Russian fleets", which were later strangely not preserved, and was soon appointed commander of the Diana sloop, leaving on a round-the-world trip to Kamchatka and Russian America ... The commander took the captain as an assistant. Lieutenant Peter Ivanovich Rikord - his peer and comrade on an English business trip, future admiral and academician.

"Diana" left Kronstadt on July 25, 1807, and arrived in Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky only on September 25, 1809. Compared to the usual duration of such trips, the delay was more than a year. However, there was a reason...

On the approach to the Cape of Good Hope, the British intercepted the sloop, and in Simonstown, the commander of the English squadron announced the beginning of the Anglo-Russian naval war in connection with the "Tilsit" transition of Russia to the side of France.

"Diana" was arrested "until appropriate instructions were received" ... Golovnin used the forced parking for scientific observations and research, but these were not just the actions of a scientifically inclined, educated sailor. It was also a military reconnaissance: Golovnin, going out to sea on a boat, studied the prevailing wind directions off the coast and in the ocean.

"Diana" stood in the depths of the Siman Gulf next to the flagship "Proserpina", surrounded by English ships. They guarded her tightly. And yet, after being arrested for a year and 25 days, Golovnin left! On May 16, 1809, he waited for a squall in the evening, raised anchor, set storm sails and left! *"All officers, midshipmen, non-commissioned officers and privates - all worked to one on Mars and yards,"* Golovnin wrote in his diary.

In the spring of 1810, he leaves with a cargo of food for Russian American settlements, and in the spring of 1811 his second "odyssey" begins. He receives the task to explore the Russian zone of the Pacific Ocean, including the Kuril Islands.

Golovnin accurately established that the Kuril ridge consists of twenty-four, and not twenty-one islands. On Rasshua - an island in the middle of the ridge, the inhabitants proudly presented him with a letter issued at the end of the 18th century by the Irkutsk Governor-General on their acceptance into Russian citizenship.

But the southern Kuriles were a zone, in fact, "no man's land", and there were Japanese in Kuna-shir. "Diana" maneuvered for more than two weeks near the islands of Iturup, Shikotan and Kunashir, and on July 4, 1811, she anchored at the harbor of Kunashir, and Golovnin with seven sailors went to the island. The Japanese greeted him kindly, led to the fortress, and there ... captured.

Later, they explained this as retaliation for the action of Khvostov-Davydov, who, on the instructions of Rezanov, burned Japanese warehouses on Sakhalin and the southern Kuriles.

Rikord wanted to go to the rescue, but the Diana could not come ashore because of the shallow depths, and fears for the results of research that could die also played a role. Golovnin somehow managed to convey the order to Rikord to leave.

July 14 Rikord left. In September he left for Irkutsk, where the governor informed him of his petition to organize a rescue expedition.

On July 22, 1812, "Diana" Rikorda and the brig "Zotik" went to Kunashir, but not far from it they met the ship of the Japanese merchant Takaya Kahi, who said that Golovnin and his comrades were transferred to the prison of the city of Hakodate in Hokkaido. During this time, Golovnin, by the way, managed to escape - on April 24, 1812, but nine days later he and his comrades were captured.

Rikord got nothing from the Japanese. The first news of Napoleon's invasion reached the Land of the Rising Sun (by the way, the suspicious speed with which these news reached Japan suggests anti-Russian tricks of secret agents of the Anglo-Saxons on the Japanese islands). Accordingly, the Japanese behaved arrogantly.

Everything changed a year later - Russian troops won victories in Europe, and the results affected the Far East - the Japanese became helpful, polite, and on October 1, 1813, the captives were released.

I note in brackets that in the academic three-volume Russian America of 1999, edited by N. Bolkhovitinov, such compliance of the Japanese is explained differently - the Japanese, they say, were convinced that the Russian government was not involved in the actions of Khvostov and Davydov, which Academician Bolkhovitinov certifies, by the way, as "robbery"...

What a pitiful, historically bastard explanation, quite worthy of the times when Russians are being belittled in their own eyes and in the eyes of the outside world ... Yes, the Japanese could explain their new loyalty to the Russians in this way - saving face. They couldn't admit that they were releasing Golovnin under the impression of Napoleon's collapse! And is it really so difficult to understand this without showing amazing scientific and moral blindness?

The Japanese captivity made it possible for Golovnin to create an amazing essay "Notes of the Fleet Captain Golovnin about his adventures as a prisoner of the Japanese in 1811, 1812 and 1813..."

Batyushkov called it "Montaigne among the Japanese" ...

The history of the Notes is no less unique than they themselves. Without paper, Vasily Mikhailovich kept his prison "ship journal", skillfully tying and weaving into various knots (and he, an experienced sailor, had a large supply of them) multi-colored threads! Each conversation, event, fact had its own color and node.

He pulled threads from the cuffs, the uniform and the lining of the uniform, from the officer's scarf ... "Notes",

published for the first time in 1816, quickly translated into all European languages. And then in Japanese...

What is remarkable! The Decembrist Küchelbecker, reading the Notes while imprisoned in the Sveaborg fortress in 1832, wrote in his diary: "This is *one of the best books in Russian both in style and in content. Reading Golovnin, it is impossible not to fall in love with the Japanese, despite their oddities.*

Think, reader! Russian sailor writes notes in captivity, in a damp prison cell, captured the Japanese treacherously, but he writes in such a way that his compatriot is imbued **with love for a foreign people!**

That's how! Like this...

In 1816, forty-year-old Golovnin was appointed an honorary member of the State Admiralty Department, and a year later he went *on* his second trip around the world on a sloop. "Kamchatka".

There is an amazing, if you think about it, document relating to this second voyage and linking two glorious Russian names at once - Gavriil Andreevich Sarychev and Vasily Mikhailovich Golovnin. This document is "Instruction of the State Admiralty Department to the commander of the sloop *Kamchatka*, Captain V.M. Golovnin", dated August 13 (25), 1817. She signed like this:

"*Vice Admiral Sarychev, State Councilor A. Labzin* (Alexander Fedorovich Labzin - writer and member of the Admiralty Department since 1804. - S.K.), *Oberberg-Hauptmann 4th class Loginov* (Matvey Ivanovich Loginov - Director of the Panoptic Institute and an indispensable member of the Admiralty Department. - S.K.), *Fedor Schubert* (Fedor Ivanovich Schubert - astronomer, since 1783 in the Russian service, since 1813 an honorary member of the Admiralty Department. - S.K.)".

Despite such a representative collective signature, the "Instruction ..." bears clear traces of Sarychev's authorship. Only he, who himself carried out cartographic surveys on a leather canoe, could give such specific advice (precisely advice, and not "leadership instructions") on how best to organize the description of the Kamchatka and Alaska coasts when using it, or write about one of the Alaskan bays: "*During the expedition of Captain Billings, Captain Sarychev intended to inspect this bay, but late at night and opposite winds then prevented him; and therefore it would be desirable in the event of your being in those places, if time permits, to fulfill the intention of Sarychev.*

These "preferably..." and "if time permits..." are very characteristic of the spirit and style of the "Instructions..." - extremely respectful towards Golovnin and his tasks.

I read it, and almost tears welled up in my eyes - how can we, Russians, be exposed as lacking initiative, slavishly trembling bosses, etc., and here is the official order of one Russian person to another Russian person. And everything in it is filled with ideas of intelligent initiative, independence, trust in the experience of someone whose experience can and should be trusted ...

"*When you first set off on a trip around the world in 1807,*" Sarychev wrote, "*you were given instructions from the Admiralty Department with detailed instructions on how to act during your voyage regarding determining the path, keeping a journal and making useful comments in it. Now the department, having ascertained by experience in your knowledge and abilities, does not find the need to repeat the same prescriptions and relies in everything on your art and prudence.*

And then all the necessary directive instructions are accompanied by the reservations "judging by the time and circumstances...", "it would be useful to have your courses...", "if circumstances allow.....

There is one place in the "Instructions ..." where the connection of times is revealed in the most convincing - businesslike way: "*Approaching Kamchatka, try to cut the swimming line with your course*

ship "Glory to Russia" in 1790 ... " Sarychev himself sailed on this ship that year ...

And Golovnin again left Kronstadt for the Pacific Ocean - to lay new courses for the glory of Russia.

He went to Russian California, writing, among other things: *"Russian industrialists go one by one and two by two to shoot wild goats in the forests, often spend the night with the Indians and return without receiving any harm or resentment from them. On the contrary, the Spaniards, in small numbers and without weapons, do not dare to appear among them, otherwise they will all be killed. These Indians give their daughters in marriage to Russians and Aleuts who have settled with them; and in the fortress of Ross now there are many of them ... "*

Golovnin also had the task of inspecting Russian America, and in his report on it, he expressed, first of all, indignation at the impunity of the Yankees, who were carrying out robbery, predation, beating sea animals in Russian possessions and constantly provoking the Indians against the Russians to the universal cries of freedom and respect for "human rights "(They waved this non-wearing" rag "even then!)

Golovnin was surprised: *"I don't understand how to reconcile the obvious enmity of these Republicans towards us with the rights of the people?"*

With regard to the claims of the US Congress committee against the Russian Northwest, which I have already mentioned, coast of America right up to the 60th degree, Golovnin wrote:

"It is very strange that none of the members of this committee managed to read any of the many books published in English (which is natural to them) ... in all of which ... it is mentioned that the Russians, before all Europeans, discovered the northwestern coast of America and before all occupied him."

And then he asked a legitimate and ironic question:

"Does the committee think that the Russians did not lay claim to these shores because they did not inform all states about them by ministerial notes; but it does not seem to its members that opening the earth, occupying it and establishing itself in it was revered in all ages and among all peoples by the most valid of all diplomatic acts."

Surely! What - the British, French, Spaniards, Dutch and others informed each other by "ministerial notes" about their colonial discoveries and occupation? Of course not. So why did the Russians suddenly have to blunt their feathers? Did we not have equal rights?

And after all, Vasily Mikhailovich was not a diplomat, but he refuted the claims of the Yankees with purely diplomatic arguments based on a deep understanding of the essence and principles of international rights.

And I, reading these calm lines, written by the hand of a Russian patriot, again thought: "What after all, the stranger Nesselrode was an enemy of the Russian cause, and what a bastard was the "Angloman" Poletika "...

As for Alexander, once again I can say one thing: "Eh!"

I already wrote that Golovnin agreed with the Decembrists in many respects. Zavalishin in his later notes admitted: *"Me and Golovnin were brought together by a common indignation against flagrant abuses and a common desire to find measures against them for the proper development of social and state life. We finally became friends, as far as this huge difference in years allowed. I often spent evenings with him."*

With bitter irony and deeply hidden anger, defending the ideas of a mighty Russian fleet, Golovnin wrote: *"It would be bold of me in political matters to object to people who are engaged in politics according to their position, people decorated with powder and embroidered caftans. But, as you know, not*

every hero who wears spurs and uniforms; not every subtle diplomat who is honored with the title of ambassador, and not all the thrones have Solomons ... And I do not consider myself obliged to blindly agree with the opinion that the destruction of the Russian fleet is necessary for Russia ... "

And it would not hurt to read it, remembering it firmly, to the current admirals of the "Russian fleet", which is being sunk on an even keel by the highest "state" "Russian" power.

Versatilely educated, truly intellectual, Golovnin was like an outstanding military a maritime thinker and an outstanding practitioner. In 1823, he was appointed quartermaster general of the fleet, and from 1827, the Shipbuilding, Commissariat and Artillery departments were also transferred to his jurisdiction.

In his work "On the state of the Russian fleet in 1824", even thirty years after the death of the author, published under the pseudonym "Midshipman Seafarers", Golovnin wrote about millions, "from the content our naval forces abducted."

But the quartermaster general had considerable rights, and since 1827 - considerable opportunities. and Golovnin used them to the fullest, as they say, "coil" ...

However, both before him and after him, others did the same. But if almost all of these "others" used their government posts to "correct" personal affairs, then Golovnin at least temporarily changed the direction of the state cash flow - not into the pockets of embezzlers, but for the construction of ships.

During his tenure-general, 26 ships were built at the Baltic and Arkhangelsk shipyards. battleships, 26 frigates, and in total - up to two hundred new ships, including ten military ships!

For me, the all-Russian significance of this devilishly, to the point of tears, Russian figure is also revealed in the fact that he was elected an honorary member of Kharkov University. How true! After all, he, who formally became a dignitary, did not become a "capital thing" in anything, remaining a true son of the entire Russian Land all his life ...

In his last years he was also a member of the RAC Council.

Vasily Mikhailovich Golovnin DIED in 1831, according to sources, from cholera. His friend and age of the same age, Rikord, died in 1855, and therefore it can be judged that Golovnin left too early and, if I may say so, at the wrong time.

In the same year and from the same - according to the sources - another most educated and active Russian patriot died - the explorer of Russian America and the Far East, Admiral Sarychev, who in 1828-1830 served as Minister of the Navy and Chief of the Naval Staff (which, by the way, Usually, for some reason, it is hushed up).

And we will never know what really happened there. Did they really fall victim cholera vibrio, or misty Albion had a hand in their death in a convenient situation ...

And, I dare to assure you, I do not fall into paranoia, suspecting the "insidious Englishwoman" in almost all of our troubles. In our troubles, always and everywhere - ultimately - we ourselves were to blame and to blame. But we allow ourselves these troubles, including due to the very developed and irresponsible Russian innocence.

As for me, the study of our history completely saved me from this innocence ... And therefore, the coincidence of the deaths of two great Russian admirals personally makes me at least think...

During that cholera, rumors circulated in the capital that, they say, the people were poisoned by the Poles and doctors, bribed by the Poles. The Polish uprising of 1830-1831 (where the Poles themselves, as I understand it, were bribed) was just suppressed, and there were political grounds for such rumors about "poisoners".

Did these rumors have any basis in fact? Don't know...

But I know that Tsarevich Konstantin Pavlovich also died in 1831. And also - as reported sources - from cholera.

And from her - according to the sources, one of the most prominent suppressors of the Polish uprising, Count and Field Marshal Ivan Ivanovich Dibich-Zabalkansky ...

N-yes...

In addition, later I got additional "information for reflection"! And this is not the first time that I have - after a conjecture that seems somewhat adventurous even to me - come across evidence that makes it much less adventurous, and the version much more likely.

Here and here ... At the biographer Nikolai Leonid Vyskochkov, I found a well-known story of the feat and award of Alexander Ivanovich Kazarsky, commander of the 20-gun brig "Mercury", who withstood the battle on May 14 (26), 1829 with two Turkish battleships (about 110 and 74 tools).

But here is what, already unknown to me, Leonid Vladimirovich Vyskochkov wrote further about Kazarsky: "In 1831, he was with the rank of captain of the 1st rank under Nicholas I and led the protection of the imperial family during an epidemic. A.I. died. Kazarsky under unclear circumstances, officially from cholera (most likely he was poisoned) ... "

Thirty-five-year-old Kazarsky died, though not in 1831, but in 1833, during his revision of the Black Sea Fleet. He died in Nikolaev, where he discovered large thefts. However, the death of another capable Russian sailor (with a beautiful - open, Russian, poster-type face, by the way) "from cholera" cannot but lead to reflection ...

So Golovnin is a modest and great Russian man, a Russian man for all time, who would be useful to Vladimir the "Sunshine", and Yaroslav the Wise, and Peter, and Stalin, it is strange in died overnight.

And the Russian fleet was entering an era that ended with the seeming triumph of the Sinop victory and tragic heroic ending in Sevastopol ...

But Golovnin, Sarychev, Lazarev, Kornilov, Nakhimov, Kazarsky and millions of ordinary Russian people still existed and lived ...

And they lived in such a way that today we should not only be ashamed of ourselves, but also joyful for them!

After all, they are **our** ancestors.

And we are, whatever one may say, **their** descendants.

And HERE now we can return to Novo-Arkhangelsk of the times of Ferdinand Wrangel ...

He replaced Pyotr Yegorovich Chistyakov. In modern descriptions of Chistyakov's reign, there is some positive opposition even to Baranov - they say that Chistyakov managed to establish relations with the Tlingit.

But in the end, all this was the fruit of Baranov's policy. Baranov demonstrated to the Tlingit

harsh justice at the time when he tried to protect Russian America from the arbitrariness of the Yankees.

At the time of Chistyakov, there was no longer any need for this - arbitrariness was legalized by the Convention on April 5, 1824, and the Yankees did not need to incite the Tlingit Koloshi against the Russians.

For what?

The Yankee cats were now being beaten almost without hindrance, and Chistyakov could also freely hang silver medals on the chest of the Tlingit leaders with the inscription "Allied Russia" ...

Moreover, Chistyakov's predecessor, Muravyov, paid the Tlingits for sea otter skin ten to fifteen (!!) times more than the Aleuts and Kodiaks, Russian subjects, received for it. To spit in the eyes of Russia even then, it turns out, was a profitable business.

The Yankees never came close to that price. They paid off the ears with currency, for Chistyakov and, in general, for Russians forbidden - "fire water" ...

But there were still enough sea otters and beavers in Russian America for Russians, and in 1830 the captain Lieutenant Khromchenko delivered to Kronstadt furs worth one million two hundred thousand rubles. On the next flight, he also brought her to Russia for more than a million.

Under Chistyakov, the industrialist Sysoy went to the Kuriles to establish a Russian settlement on Urup Slobodchikov. Under Chistyakov, the shipyards of Novo-Arkhangelsk launched two boats - "Sivuch" and "Beaver".

Wrangel continued this line - in 1832, the colonial flotilla was replenished with a hooker yacht "Sailor" and schooners "Kvihpak" and "Chilkat" of local construction.

Under Wrangel, the dilapidated Baranovsky buildings were replaced by "new and beautiful."

Under Wrangel, there was a significant incident with the English ship of the Hudson company dryad bay...

At the mouth of the Stikine River, which flows into the Pacific Ocean approximately in the middle of the Alexander Archipelago at a latitude of approximately 55 °, in August 1833 the redoubt of St. Dionysius (Dionysius) was erected. And less than a year later, in the sight of the new Russian redoubt, the Dryad appeared with the intention of going higher and in the upper reaches of the Stikina (Stakhin) to establish a British trading post.

The headwaters of the Stikina were within the English zone and were kilometers away from the border of the Russian zone three hundred - with water. And more than two thousand from Hudson Bay by land.

Well, for God's sake - slurp with this British land of Russian jelly all two and a half thousand kilometers! By land - according to the contractual British territory ...

And the Dryad, having on board the agent of the Hudson Bay Company, Peter Skene Ogden, provocatively sailed through Russian waters, hiding behind the convention on the freedom of the English ending in 1835. impudence in the Russian Pacific borders.

Russian guy Dionysius Zarembo, who commanded the companionable 14-gun brig "Chichagov" at redoubt Dionisievsy, shortened this freedom and arrested the Dryad.

"Zarembo" is a surname of Polish origin and means "notch" ... But from Polish roots, Dionysius Fedorovich, as I understand it, only had a cheerful temper, and his pride was purely Russian - calm. And he made a good "notch" on Anglo-Saxon arrogance!

He was twice around the world, in 1814 he graduated from the navigation school, sailed on the companionships Suvorov and Borodino, later became a captain of the 1st rank and had Russian honor not in signatures under dispatches - like flyers, but in his soul. The usual fate of a RAC officer...

Wrangel approved Zarembo's actions.

And a diplomatic row ensued. London demanded for "disruption of the expedition to Stikine" nothing less than nothing, but a lot of impudent - 22,150 pounds (135,000 rubles).

Wow!

Nesselrode recognized the validity of the claims for "freedom of action", but "patriotically" protested the amount of pounds ... And the Russian Foreign Ministry tolerated this utterly empty diplomatic bastard some years.

Ogden, meanwhile, recouped himself by bribing the leaders of the Tlingit and Tsimshian Indians with the traditional anti-Russian goals for the Anglo-Saxons in northwestern America.

Wrangel, in 1832, erected a new wall in Novo-Arkhangelsk with a "Koloshenskaya battery". Its guns were aimed at the Tlingit village adjoining the city (they had nothing else to do but to support the walls of Russian settlements, but the "fire water" of the Ogdens had to be worked out).

"This fence," Wrangel reported to the directors of the RAC, "seeming to the Koloshs as an extraordinary fortress, made such an impression on them that they became very meek and cautious, never ceasing to wonder how it could be erected in such a short time."

Alas, other problems, economic ones, were growing more and more significant.

At that time, it was not the tsars who thought about the geopolitical significance of Russian America, but their smart subjects. However, even for the kings, its importance as a source of profit was then obvious. But just with the last interruptions began ...

On October 28, 1807, the Main Board of the RAC notified Emperor Alexander of its current activities and attached to the report "A Statement of the company's fishing cargo exported on the brigantine "Maria" (under the command of Lieutenant Mashina. - S.K.)".

I quote it in full:

So it used to be...

And soon after Wrangel left (he was replaced by Kupreyanov), US President Martin Van Buren, in his annual message to Congress on December 3, 1838, reported that "the capital and tonnage used by US citizens in their trade off the northwestern coast of America has been too much insignificant."

The fruits of unbridled robbery finally ripened: the fur trade was reduced, and the number of "Boston Shipmen".

Nevertheless, Van Buren believed that "the subject deserves serious consideration".

Still, the economic importance of this zone was decreasing, but its potential was increasing.

political significance...

In PETERSBURG, they thought differently, and Russian America did not occupy any serious place in Nikolai's strategic plans, despite the fact that in the three-volume 1999 N. Bolkhovitinov era, the era of the 40s is for some reason called the "heyday of RAC."

Instead of strengthening unhindered in the Far East, Russia became more and more bogged down in excessive problems for it in the Middle East ... After the Peace of Adrianople, it temporarily occupied the Danube principalities - Moldavia and Wallachia to ensure payments for indemnities ...

The French historian Antonin Debidour assessed the situation as follows: "The concluded peace was the most brilliant victory that Russia could have won at that time in the East. The arrogant and resolute policy of Nicholas I bore fruit ... He portrayed himself as a moderate man in his demands and at the same time became the ruler of the East.

The Frenchman was cunning here, wanting to hide behind loud phrases about the arrogance of Nicholas the irritation of the Anglo-French with the prospects for an alliance between Turkey and Russia. If Turkey understood that the only chance for it to maintain its importance lies in peace with Russia when Turkey withdraws from the Caucasus and from its European possessions on favorable terms for her (for example, with financial compensation from the peoples she liberates from her power or providing them with real autonomy), then peace on the southern face of the Russian borders would ensure accelerated internal development for both Russia and Turkey.

Soon, real grounds appeared for this - its former vassal, "ruler of Egypt and Arabia" Mehmed-Ali went to Turkey. He conquered Syria, occupied the fortress of Saint-Jean-d'Acre and Damascus, and on December 21, 1832, he utterly defeated the Grand Vizier Reshid-Mehmed at Konya ... By the way, I do not exclude that the British and the French incited the impudent pasha to have more freedom in Turkey political maneuver.

And the Sultan unexpectedly turned to Nicholas for help ... And ... received it - in February - April 1833, the Russian squadron landed the first landing units on the Bosphorus in the Unkiar-Iskelesi area - up to 12 thousand people. As Debidur writes: "Nicholas I's fleet anchored in front of the Sultan's palace."

Mahmoud perked up...

But now Debidur's compatriots have already become frightened, and together with them their "sworn friends" for that side of the English Channel. How? Turks negotiate with Russians?

A new French ambassador arrives in Istanbul, Baron Albin-Rhein. But he was also called differently - Admiral Roussin. Let us again give the floor to Debidur: "He was a brave man, very proud and who took the dignity of his country close to his heart. He was irritated by the sight of the Russian flag. He asked and even demanded his removal."

The reason for Roussin's irritation is understandable to me, but you cannot call it justified. It's a Russian flag I saw not on the roads of Brest, Toulon or Calais, but in the Golden Horn Bay.

I think that the admiral-baron himself appeared as an ambassador at that moment not by chance ... Under pressure from England and France, in May 1833 in Kutahya between Mahmud II and Mehmed-Ali it was concluded a truce and the Russians were asked to leave ...

And here Nikolai made his, perhaps, the only undeniably reasonable eastern move - on June 26 (July 8), 1833, Count Orlov concluded an alliance treaty with the Unkiar-Iskeles Port on eternal peace, friendship and mutual defense!

Alas, here the tsar thought not so much as a Russian geopolitician, but as a monarch. His trusted representative in Turkey, General Nikolai Nikolaevich Muravyov-Karsky, later quoted Nikolai as saying: "I want to show the Sultan my friendship. We must defend Constantinople from capture. This whole war is nothing but the continuing manifestation of the revolutionary spirit that has engulfed Europe ...".

But objectively, the purely geopolitical and political rationality of the treaty was beyond doubt. In a secret article, the Sultan undertook, at the request of Russia, not to allow warships of foreign powers to the Dardanelles. As Debidur writes: "Close the Dardanelles for all enemies of Russia."

As a result, the "best friends of Russia" had to show their true face for a while - England and

France sent strong squadrons to the Archipelago to the Turkish shores for a military demonstration. And I will once again refer to the French historian: "For several months in diplomatic circles it was believed that the possibility of a rupture and war between these powers and Russia was not ruled out."

Dear reader! I am sure that you yourself already had a natural thought: "This is necessary! Such an evil reaction merely to the sovereign right of Russia to peacefully exclude the possibility of foreign intervention in its Black Sea provinces, and also to the sovereign right of Turkey to permanently eliminate the legitimate fears of its great northern neighbor! And this is the same England that, together with the Yankees, brazenly sought to ensure its non-existent "rights" in the Russian zone of the Pacific Ocean!

N-yes...

Austria was also "concerned" ... After all, earlier Metternich "became close" to Nikolai, and Nesselrode such a "rapprochement" provided diplomatically.

In September 1833, at the initiative of Metternich, a "Congress of Monarchs" of Austria, Prussia and Russia was held in Münchengrätz, and on October 3 (15) the Berlin Convention of the Three Powers actually restored the Holy Alliance. Under the interests of Russia, another long-term mine was laid ...

And in England, the thirty-year era of the clever rogue Palmerston, about whom Marx said that he "knows how to seem attacker when he's actually pandering, and defensive when he's really betraying." And the "publicist" Urquhart publicly declared that Palmerston was bribed by Russia (most likely, he "exposed" Palmerston, who was bribed by Palmerston).

The Unkiar-Iskeles Treaty, although it dealt with eternal peace, was concluded for 8 years and was subject to renewal in 1841. However, it was not extended - at the beginning, on July 15, 1840, the London Convention was concluded between England, Russia, Austria, Prussia and Turkey to help the Sultan, all against the same Egyptian Pasha, who was almost openly supported by France.

The London Convention of 1840 abolished the Unkiar-Iskeles Treaty, and on July 13 (13th!) 1841, the same participants plus France signed the second London Convention on the Straits, depriving Russia and Turkey of the right to close the straits in case of war ... Well, could they the Anglo-French and the supranational elite to allow the peaceful development of Russian-Turkish relations?

After that, there was little left - to draw Russia into the suppression of the anti-Austrian revolution in Hungary in 1848-1849 and provoke the question of "holy places" in Turkey, paving the way for the Crimean War of the early fifties ...

The Hungarian campaign of the Russian army hit Russia seriously. In 1848 the revenue of the state budget amounted to 196,556 thousand rubles with expenses of 204,266 thousand rubles.

In fact, the costs were even greater - one mobilization cost Nikolai 17,617,143 rubles, and in total, over 90 million rubles were spent on military spending in 1848.

In 1848, the Russian government had to touch the inviolable currency reserve, taking from it 3,090,000 gold coins and 6,000,000 silver coins. After that, 105,588,595 rubles remained in coins and ingots in the "spare storeroom" of the Peter and Paul Fortress 19

kopecks.

In 1849, the "gold reserve" had to be reduced two more times, and on December 9, 1849, another foreign loan was received through the London banking office "Bering and Co." in the amount of 5 million pounds sterling (35.2 million silver rubles). And all - to cover the costs of the Hungarian campaign.

In this situation, it was not necessary to be Nikolai in order to drastically change orientation with an exhausting

Russia of European and Middle Eastern politics to an active policy of the Far East that elevates Russia ... That is, to neutralize threats to Russian America, strengthen positions in California, establish strong contacts with Japan and resolve the "Amur issue".

Some "Hungarian" money - if they were spent on strengthening the power of Russia, and not on saving the Austrian monarchy - would be enough for everything! With excess!

Alas, things turned out differently...

In 1842, the next term of RAC privileges expired, but its extension passed quietly and peacefully. And there was nothing surprising here - the RAC was increasingly losing its significance as a profitable commercial enterprise, and Russian America, after all, needed management. CANCER provided it, already in a routine way. And things went neither shaky nor rolls.

However, at that time, the fruits of positive long-term efforts also bore fruit. The seeds planted by Baranov gave good sprouts, and Russian Creoles appeared in Russian America, ready to serve Russia far from its main territory.

In fact, we usually associate the concept of "Creole" with Latin America, but here is its second interpretation by the 18th stereotypical edition of the Dictionary of Foreign Words in 1989: "a descendant from the marriages of Russians with Aleuts, Eskimos and Indians in the Aleutian Islands and Alaska in the first half 19

century"...

And here is a specific, rather unusual, but at the same time quite typical fate ... Alexander Filippovich Kashevarov ... He was born on December 28 (Old Style) 1809 in Pavlovsk Harbor on Kodiak Island in the family of a Russian teacher and an Aleut. Twelve years as a pupil of the RAC, he was first sent to a private boarding school in St. Petersburg, and then to a navigational school. In 1828, on the company ship "Elena", he went on his first round-the-world trip from European Russia to American Russia - to his homeland.

He was the head of a hydrographic expedition to explore the shores of Northwest America. In 1850-1856 he commanded the port of Ayan in the Sea of Okhotsk. In 1860 he was promoted to captain of the 1st rank, and in 1865 he was dismissed with the promotion to major general. He died on September 25, 1870, cut off from his father's places in the same way that millions of living Russian people, who were born, say, in Kiev, are now cut off from their native places by the black line of the Belaya Vezha.

Ryazan...

Andrei Kondratievich Glazunov was also the son of a Russian and an Aleut. In 1834, on assignment Wrangel described the delta of the Kvihpak River (we better know it as the Yukon).

And in March 1838, together with the Creole Peter Vasilyevich Malakhov, he reached the middle currents of the Yukon, conducting geodetic surveys.

In the same year, the Creole sailor Petr Fedorovich Kolmakov (son of the Russian industrialist Fedor Lavrentievich Kolmakov) put on the map a major tributary of the Yukon - the Innoko River.

Known in the history of Russian Alaska are Creoles Andrey Ustyugov - a navigator, hydrographer and cartographer, and Ivan Semenovich Lukin - an employee of the RAC, a fur trader and also an explorer of Alaska, who completed the discovery of Kvipak, climbing it to the Russian-Canadian border.

And the son of a Russian and an Aleut, Andrey Ilyich Klimovsky, who graduated from the Baltic Navigation School! Sent, like Kashevarov, by the Baranovs to study maritime affairs, having come to St. Petersburg from Kodiak on Lisiansky's Neva, after completing the course, he returned to his homeland and explored the Mednaya River in 1819. Then he sailed on company ships, commanded the Aktsia schooner, explored the Shantar Islands ...

These are only the best, distinguished by something and marked by history.

And HERE it is impossible not to say at least a little about one of the last, perhaps the brightest figures in the history of Russian exploration of Alaska - Lavrenty Alekseevich Zagoskin (a relative, by the way, of Mikhail Nikolayevich Zagoskin, author of the historical novel "Yuri Miloslavsky").

Born in 1808, from an old noble family, as a nineteen-year-old midshipman on the frigate "Agile" he sailed to England, and at twenty-four, as a lieutenant, he received the steamship "Araks" under command.

Three years later, the Araks burned down, and its commander, by the highest confirmation, was demoted to sailors until seniority without deprivation of the nobility. The rank, however, was soon returned to him, he remained in Kronstadt, and at the age of thirty he entered the service of the RAC. First he commanded the brig "Baikal", and then - the ship "Elena".

In 1842, Zagoskin was appointed head of an expedition to explore the largest rivers in Alaska - the Kuskokuim and the Kwikpak (Jacklondon Yukon). Russian people have already been there - in the mid-90s of the 18th century, a detachment of the foreman of the fishing artel, Vasily Ivanov, skied into the basin of Kuskokuim and Yukon. Now Zagoskin was going there...

For two years, moving on foot, on dogs, on canoes, he conducted geodetic surveys in summer and winter. shooting, determined many astronomical points.

One of his bases was the coastal Russian settlement of St. Michael's Redoubt, another was the Russian settlement on Kuskokuim Kolmakov redoubt.

As a result, in 1847, the first detailed geographical description of the interior of Alaska appeared - "A pedestrian inventory of a part of Russian possessions in America, produced in 1842, 1843 and 1844 years."

Lavrenty Alekseevich accurately indicated by the very name that he and his comrades had explored only part of the Russian possessions. The obtained knowledge about mainland Russian America showed how little we know about it.

Alas, even then the artificial decline of RAC began. Inner Alaska has already been explored to the end Americans - almost twenty years after they bought it from us, in the 80s.

Since 1847, Zagoskin became a member of the Russian Geographical Society, and the next year he retired with the rank of lieutenant commander. He lived a long time, he died in 1890, that is, long before his death, he witnessed the collapse of the work to which he gave his best strength.

And naturally, he reacted painfully to the sale of Alaska.

IN THE FORTY years, Russian America also suffered its first serious systemic and territorial loss - Fort Ross was sold for nothing.

Back in 1806, in a secret note by Rezanov to the Minister of Commerce Rumyantsev dated June 17 (29), it was said that our trade with California could have a million turnover.

On January 28 (February 9), 1808, the leading director of the Main Board of the RAC Buldakov wrote about the same to the emperor himself, and some parts of his note look so incredible that when reading them, you don't know whether to shrug your shoulders, or resort to "profanity", or bang your head against the age-old Russian walls from the thought: "Well, why, why did we miss and are missing the most profitable opportunities!" ...

Here is what Buldakov wrote:

Buldakov wrote that when Rezanov bought grain in California (I note that it was intended to rot in advance), several hundred heads of cattle were killed only to put this grain in their skins, and they simply threw the meat ...

And on the other side of the Pacific Ocean - a month's sea journey from California - Siberians puffed up with hunger...

However, not everything went smoothly in sunny California, because, having written all this, "the leading director and cavalier" continued: *"California has the greatest shortage of all sorts of canvases and iron. Instead of this latter, leather belts are used there to strengthen the house buildings in connection, supporting even the ceilings and everything else that hangs with great burden. Russia, however, has not only this metal, but also canvases in abundance and can supply other countries with them without impoverishment."*

So, there was not only the possibility of mutual benefit, but the broadest multifaceted prospect. Moreover, Buldakov, according to the notes of the late Rezanov, cited the opinion of the California governor "don de Arillaga" (Jose Joaquin Arillaga): *"If the court of Madrid knew the need of this region, then it would probably start mutual trade relations with Russia."*

Rezanov hinted to Arillaga that bread could also be brought to Russian possessions from Canton, but it would be better and easier from California, if Madrid agreed.

Arillaga agreed and at the same time complained about the "impudence of the Bostonians" - they say, they also conduct smuggling trade, and, as Rezanov wrote, "they constantly darken along the banks and look for means ... to settle in Spanish possessions."

Therefore, the Russian chamberlain and the Spanish governor looked at the problem in the same way - if they act together, agree on a common cruising "to protect their new subjects" with the allocation of "a frigate or military corvette" for this, then "the colonies will flourish, and our shores, constituting a mutual communication between themselves, will always be equally protected by both powers and no one will he will not dare to enter between them..."

The Spaniards did not experience much joy from the new neighbors (and the founding of Fort Ross did not add it to them). But the Russians were still better than the "Bostonians", especially since the American merchants were only harbingers of future political expansion, which the Yankees logically followed with a straight line. annexation.

Buldakov asked Alexander about an agreement with the Madrid court about a free parcel to California, no more than two ships a year calling at San Francisco, Monterey and San Diego.

At the direction of the emperor, Rumyantsev communicated with the Russian ambassador in Madrid, Stroganov. But then major political changes began in Spain, and the matter died out. And Rumyantsev on December 1 (13), 1809, informed the RAC board that the tsar allowed a Russian settlement to be organized in California - "to establish it at will on his own, encouraging in any case by his royal intercession" ...

So the Californian idea received a new development and, if the reader remembers, in 1812 *Ivan Kuskov Kusov* approved it with the bookmark of Fort Ross.

By the beginning of the 19th century, as in the 17th century, all of California (both mainland Upper and peninsular Lower) was part of Spanish Mexico. Fort Ross, however, was outside the Spanish colonization - Ivan Kuskov put it that way.

Even before Kuskov, in 1804, the navigator Shvetsov, an employee of the RAC, visited here. On the instructions of Baranov, he, at the head of a detachment of industrialists on twenty canoes, went from Kodiak to San Diego Bay on the border

Upper and Lower California.

In 1808, he repeated his campaign and, not reaching San Francisco Bay, discovered Rumyantsev Bay (Bodega) at 38 degrees north latitude. On the shore, he laid a copper plate with the coat of arms and the inscription "Land of Russian possession."

It was about here (slightly higher to the north) that Kuskov chose a place for Ross.

THE fact that the Spaniards actually recognized Russia's rights to this small enclave is already proved by the fact that they did not make any official diplomatic demarches to the new neighbors, but simply "supported" their possessions "from below" in 1817, laying south of the Russian settlement - between Fort Rossom and San Francisco - their missions San Rafael and Ignazio.

And then things unfolded like this...

As we remember, in 1821 Mexico declared independence from Spain. And then Mexico suddenly demanded the liquidation of the Russian colony. But, of course, not on their own initiative. The problem was not in the claims of the Mexicans, but in the fact that it was going to the annexation of Upper California United States.

The states then pretended to be "rapprochement" with us (later, already under Nicholas, they were actively supported in this by the pro-American Russian envoy to the United States, Bodisko), and therefore they had to act in a roundabout way, in which the Yankees and their supranational patrons were masters no less than in a brazen (if allowed) direct pressure ...

After all, it is one thing to liquidate Fort Ross at the hands of the Mexicans, and then liquidate the jurisdiction of Mexico over this territory. And it is a completely different matter to first liquidate the jurisdiction of Mexico, include California in the United States, and then demand that Russia liquidate Fort Ross.

You look - it was so possible to anger even Alexander, who was loyal to the Yankees, and there were Petersburg negotiations on the upcoming conventions.

There was no need for the States to start a quarrel with us, and they launched the "hot" Mexican caballeros forward ... Actually, my dear reader, the above is purely my personal interpretation of events. "Notebook" historians may frown at her - there are no documents!

But what is there! What are we - the methods of the Yankees do not know, or something!

Years passed ... neither Fort Pocc nor Russian America received serious reinforcements. Surrounded by the Americans, Fort Ross could have been kept, but this required the strength of not one, either state or private, company, but the will of the entire power. Indeed, even in 1848, when Upper California was ceded to the United States under the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, San Francisco was a small port with population of 2000 people.

Ferdinand Wrangel, when he was the ruler of Russian America, led, say, unofficial negotiations on the preservation of the colony in exchange for the recognition of Mexican independence, but without success.

Decisive action was needed, both economic and political. However, Nikolai, proud of something else, did not go for it. He was steadily influenced by Nesselrode. And in December 1841, Fort Ross was sold to an American of Swiss origin, John Sutter (also known as Sutter, Johann Suter) for forty thousand dollars (before that, he had already founded his own settlement near our settlement). So the great squatter adventurer replaced the power as the owner of these places.

However, Mexico did not demand any liquidation from the squatter. Yes, and Russia could not (!) Claim

from him even those unfortunate forty thousand that were due to her.

Moreover! Seven years after we surrendered Fort Ross, a Super worker, carpenter John Marshall, accidentally discovered gold in the Sacramento River Valley ... Soon, the Californian "Golden fever"...

But the Russians did not wash gold in their former possessions ...

This gold did not bring happiness, by the way, to Sutter himself. Stefan Zweig dedicated a short story to this dark (he presented him, however, as a romantic eccentric) adventurer in the cycle "Humanity's Star Clock", but Sutter died in poverty and obscurity.

I don't feel sorry for him though...

The year 1848 has come - the year of the European revolution ... Russian nationalists claim that its true creators were not fighters for the freedom of peoples, but guardians for the freedom of profits ... I think that both of them were actually involved in this revolution ...

On the one hand, the monarchical principle was really becoming obsolete, but on the other hand, the European upheavals were also beneficial to the dark elite of the world... No wonder Jawaharlal Nehru correctly noted in his "A Look at World History": "While Europe was undergoing revolution and repression, the United States was expanding its territories in the West. Repression in Europe contributed to emigration, stories about vast expanses and high wages (*now it is called "political technologies."* - S.K.) attracted many immigrants from European countries to America. As the west of the country was settled, new states were formed there, which joined the Union.

And in Europe there was still another union - the Holy ... And this mine, laid by Metternich in 1833, it worked - Nikolai moved to suppress the revolution ...

What for?

To spend in a couple of years an amount equal to the entire emergency reserve of the empire? To let the London banker Bering cash in on a new loan and prevent Russia from taking advantage of the results of the efforts of the Russian Bering the navigator?

While working on this book, I accidentally (although - how to say!) Stumbled upon an assessment of those events by Metropolitan Platon of Kiev twenty years after the Russian campaign of 1849: the way to Constantinople would open for us, and there is no doubt that there would be no Crimean War. Austria surprised the world with her ingratitude..."

This assessment by the loyal Metropolitan is very significant. As for the fact that the world was surprised at the ingratitude of the Austrians, Plato, of course, went too far ... All world powers (except Russia) and smaller "powers" considered ingratitude as a natural element of their foreign policy, and if they were surprised, it was the "chivalrous" stupidity of the Russian Tsar , who, instead of taking advantage of the situation to strengthen himself within natural boundaries, dragged

chestnuts from the fire for others...

Plato's dreams of "the gates of Tsar-grad" were also out of place.

But the remark about the Crimean War in the mouth of Nicholas's opponent is by no means worth a lot! Expensive because it is absolutely true!

Dear reader! The author of this book has already written three books about relations between Russia and Germany, about how two naturally friendly powers, using the same technology, played off at first in

First, and then - and in the Second World War. Perhaps the reader is familiar with them ...

At the same time, I first figured out the technology of pitting the USSR and the Third Reich, and only then I was amazed at how similar it was to the technology of organizing a war between the Russian and German empires...

But, having got acquainted closer with the prehistory of the Crimean War, I was even more amazed! Amazed, because the technology of its preparation reminded me very much of the previous two!

At first, they suddenly began to inflate the issue of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher in Palestine, than the king, as they say, was "brought in". And after a personal letter from Nicholas to the Sultan, at the beginning of 1852, a firman was issued on the return of the priority rights of the Russian Church.

But even before that, the curé Boret came out in Paris with a pamphlet accusing the Orthodox clergy of seizing the shrines formerly controlled by the French. Here, the newly-baked emperor of France, Louis Napoleon, raised a cry about the infringement of the rights of Catholics in Turkey - they say that France is also a Christian power and wants to join the "holy places" lost to it half a century ago ... The fact that Catholics - there are almost no Turkish subjects, somehow it was overlooked ...

So, out of nowhere, the conflict between France and Russia grew, with the activation of anti-Russian forces in Turkey.

London assured the Russian ambassador Brunnov of supporting Russia, and Brunnov assured Nikolai of the same (London would later incite both Wilhelm II and Hitler in the same way) ... The British deftly created the impression of complete isolation of France from the Russians.

Himself from the Courland nobles, born in 1797, a graduate of the University of Leipzig, Brunnov from 1832 becomes a close and confidant of Nesselrode. He was ambassador in London from 1840 to 1854 and from 1858 to 1874 (!) Years, "neutralized" the Black Sea straits in 1840-1841 and assured St. Petersburg that "if England is not with us, then she is still no longer belongs to France...

He was a brilliant stylist, witty, wrote quickly, rarely corrected what was written. Wherein he never crossed out what was unnecessary, but carefully scraped it out and was proud of his ability to scrape.

Well, he knew how to scrape ...

On March 2, 1844, the head of the English cabinet, Robert Peel, in a public panegyric to Brunnov, exclaimed: "I can safely say that we have never had a representative of a foreign power more devoted to the interests of his homeland and less inclined to make a deal with his honor or with anything relating to the obligation to respect the interests they represent".

Knowing how people in England "love" those who love not England, but really their homeland, Brunnov's assessment Peel could be objectively viewed up to the "vice versa"...

And largely thanks to the "sightseeing" Brunnov, the tsar retained illusions about the position England almost to the moment of the catastrophe - the appearance of England and France on the side of Turkey.

On one of the last dispatches of Brunnov, who informed in view of the war already decided in London with Russia that England would not support Russia against Turkey, the tsar wrote: "*This is vile.*"

Sixty years later, an inscription in the same spirit on one of the pre-war London dispatches of the German ambassador to the Anglophile Lichnowski will be made by Kaiser Wilhelm II ... And in 1854 the Crimean War began, and Russia turned out to be isolated, abandoned by everyone.

However, here I involuntarily fall into a stamp rolled by memoirs of historians. In order to be abandoned, you must have someone nearby before that. In order to be devoted, one must first have

friends.

But Russia - after it became a factor in world politics through the efforts of Peter and his people - never had any friends and allies in the outside world! Only Prussia was reservedly loyal to us. And therefore, one could more or less count on partnership with her.

The Turks, on the other hand, could be neutralized by gradually moving no further than the Caucasus zone to the south. east and no further than the border of the lower Danube in the southwest.

So on the eve of the Crimean War, no one betrayed Russia, except for its elite. And if we take into account that in terms of foreign policy this elite was personified by Karl Nesselrode, then here one can hardly talk about betrayal ... The Nesselrods and the Brunnovs never betrayed Russia, because they never served Russia.

Even when the war was going on, Ivan Sergeevich Maltsov, a member of the Council of the Russian Foreign Ministry, wanted to publish a very innocent article in the ministerial organ "Jornal de St-Petersbourg", in one place of which he only said that the British were waging a pirate war off our coasts.

Nesselrode forced him to strike out this expression as "too offensive" ...

N-yes.

AT THE TIME, as in Europe, Russia was meanly, but cleverly led to the Crimean War, playing on the feeling of her alleged dignity, in the Far East this feeling was not particularly noticed.

Only public opinion (it was in Russia, after all) was indignant at our lethargy there. And in 1844, the department of Nesselrode informed the Main Board of the RAC that according to. By order of Nicholas, the company is invited to take over the survey of the Amur.

That is, a great power - so as not to disturb England and not push her to activity (!) in this region, hid behind the back of a formally private RAC.

In 1846, an employee of the RAC, second lieutenant-"circumnavigator" Alexander Gavrilo, on the companion brig "Konstantin", went to the mouth of the Amur, explored the eastern part of the Sakhalin Gulf and opened the bay off the northern coast of Sakhalin, giving it a very suitable name for that era - Obmana Bay (in 1849, Nevelskoy renamed it Baikal Bay in honor of his ship, the Baikal transport.

Wrongly oriented relative to the non-navigability of Amu

pa, the director of the RAC Wrangel ordered Gavrilo in case of discovery of shoals in the Amur estuary "do not endanger the ship, for it is positively known that the mouth of the river is inaccessible."

Gavrilo followed the instructions literally, he did not go far. And it turned out something like "pumping" the laser: Wrangel sent the wrong impulse to Gavrilo. Gavrilo, "pumped up" by Wrangel, reflected it to Wrangel ... And a ray of untruth broke out into the light. And the beam is involuntarily deceitful ... And Nesselrode, forwarding the report of Ferdinand Petrovich to Nikolai, attributed with pleasure from himself: "The Amur River does not have for Russia doesn't matter."

I already wrote about Nikolai's resolution about the uselessness of Cupid in Chapter 1 ...

The United States was progressing at that time, but at that time there was no need to talk about their serious industrial development. However, population growth, skillfully spurred on by massive European emigration, was impressive, up to 35 percent in a decade. In 1830, 12,875,000 people lived in the United States, and by 1880 it was planned to have 50 million. Such a natural growth could not be ensured by any forces. But he was, after all, unnatural, artificially forced.

In fact, economic growth had similar features. Here is a picture from nature...

After the annexation of Oregon in 1846 and especially California with San Francisco in 1848, the development of the Pacific coast begins. And then Secretary of State John M. Clayton requested an opinion on US interests in this zone from one of the wealthiest businessmen in San Francisco, J. L. Folsom.

Now, Folsom lamented that the Russians almost monopolized the steamboat traffic from Sitka to San Francisco because they had an abundance of coal on Kodiak and other places along the coast. At the same time, Folsom argued that "steam navigation, without a doubt, is designed to become the most effective means in the implementation of American predominance in the Pacific Ocean."

But the Russians have coal. And it turned out that it was easier for the Russians to achieve dominance.

What to do? But, according to Folsom, what: to demand from the Russians free access to the Yankees to Russian coal. And if the Russians refuse, then introduce a "discriminatory (this is the definition of Folsom himself. — S. K.) duty" on Russian goods brought to American ports.

And no "human rights" for you!

In the United States, all internal forces ensured internal development, while in Russia internal development turned out to be a hostage to an exhausting foreign policy.

And was it possible to talk about development adequate to the challenges of the century? Almost until his death in 1845 - until 1844, Count Kankrin was the Minister of Finance of Russia. So, in a letter to Annenkov from Ostend on September 20, 1847, Nikolai Vasilievich Gogol wrote: *"We had two statesmen in Russia not so long ago who uttered two different sayings. Arakcheev said: 'What I know, I know, and what I don't know, I don't want to know.' Kankrin, Yegor Frantsovich, once put it this way: 'Gracious sir, I know everything, I don't even know what I don't know' ... "*

So, Kankrin, in a purely local style, considered himself omniscient. But this "know-it-all" missed (?) with his weak eyes the beginning of serious scientific and technological progress, and Russia came to the Crimean War without a network of railways, without the mechanical engineering it needed ...

Serfdom? It, of course, played its black role, but dignitary eyes were even more important, point-blank not wanting to look in the right direction ... It was Kankrin who was an active opponent of railways in Russia. And is Kankrin the only one!

And therefore, even the agricultural in the recent past, the United States, in the near future, could bypass us, if not in military potential (before that, it was not close yet), then in iron military shipbuilding.

And this already threatened with a loss of strength in the naval sphere. That is, in the area in which Russia, with its new activity in Northwest America, willy-nilly, would have to face the Yankees seriously - right up to the thunder of naval guns.

At the turn of the thirties and forties, the RAC no longer had a single bright figure in its leadership - except for the directorship of Wrangel from 1840 to 1847. But Wrangel alone could do little, especially since Nesselrode was a constant stumbling block.

Fort Ross became increasingly unprofitable. Even Alexander Bodisko, the Russian envoy to Washington, offered to buy this zone from Spain officially, but the same Nesselrode thwarted everything.

The Hudson's Bay Company (KGZ) did not let up about the "notch" with the Dryad and ended up On January 25 (February 6), 1839, an agreement between the RAC and the KGZ on "cooperation" was signed in Hamburg (?!).

And the very fact that Nesselrode's approval immediately followed said everything about the character

agreement, and about its uselessness for the future of Russian America.

The geopolitically most promising region more and more resembled a suitcase without a handle from a joke - and it is inconvenient to carry, and it is a pity to throw it away ...

In the United States, at the end of the forties, the theory of "predestination of fate" (Manifest Destiny) became popular - they say, providence itself intended the United States to dominate the entire American continent.

And Bodisko calmly reported that, in his opinion, "the Americans are convinced that the Russians are real and the only political friends you can rely on" ... These words are taken from his report to Nesselrode of February 23 (March 7), 1839, but and later his opinion

fundamentally did not change - the Yankees are not enemies, but friends ...

And the "friends" in February 1849 already published articles with titles like "Russian America - our Pacific dominions.

In February 1848, John Quincy Adams died. But his spirit, one might say, was reborn in the face worthy of his follower (worthy both in impudence and in arrogance) - forty-seven years old

Senator William Henry Seward. "I have lost a patron, a teacher, an adviser and a friend - the one whom I loved no less than my closest relative, and honored above all mortals among people," said the future Secretary of State, who in almost twenty years will put the last point in the history of Russian America.

In the same 1848, the increase in the production of whale oil, obtained by American whalers off the coast of Russian America and in the Bering and Okhotsk Seas, compared to 1840, amounted to ten and a half thousand (!) Percent! Having knocked out the whales in warmer waters, the Yankees moved to the Russian high latitudes. If in 1840 they extracted 1,760 barrels of fat with three vessels, then in 1848, 159 vessels extracted 185,253 barrels of it. And the maximum was reached in 1852 - 373,450 barrels ...

Nesselrode only shrugged his shoulders: "The right to the closed sea in relation to the northern part of the Pacific ocean cannot be theoretically proven..."

Here's how - even theoretically!

But what is there to prove! In the zone closed to foreigners by the Decree of Alexander of September 4, 1821, there was simply nothing for foreigners to do! International trade routes did not and could not run there, and to the north of the Alexander border there were and could not be any possessions other than Russians, as well as further - beyond the Bering Strait ...

The FIFTY years became the years of the final, but unnatural destruction of Russian America. But even then, the Yankees did not look, for example, at Oregon as something unambiguously theirs by full right and cockily - to themselves - defended this right, declaring that no one in the United States wants this territory to fall into the hands of Russia!

Eh! If only we had stretched these hands to Oregon - and even thirty or forty years earlier! But because it never happened!

What's the matter with Oregon - it's already "pickles", geopolitical "delicacies"! After all, we did not cherish, did not appreciate the "Alaska-Aleutian" edge of the vitally necessary "bread" for Russia, which became our great work!

But Seward, during the Crimean War, delivered a very frank speech in Saint Paul (Minnesota): "Standing here and looking to the Northwest, I see a Russian who is preoccupied with the construction

harbors, settlements and fortifications at the tip of this continent as outposts of St. Petersburg, and I can say: "Go on and build your outposts along the entire coast even to the Arctic Ocean - they will nevertheless become outposts of my own country - monuments to the civilization of the United States on Northwest"..."

By the way, this quote alone is enough to just grin at the academic assurances (of the same academician Bolkhovitinov) that, they say, the Yankees almost did us a favor by buying Alaska from Russia, which they absolutely do not need, reluctantly, just in case that the US Senate had to be persuaded for a long time to authorize for this purpose at least that modest amount, which he authorized.

DURING THE FIRST decades of its heyday, RAC turned into a powerful enterprise under virtual state control. She competed with the Canadian Hudson's Bay Company and the East India Company.

15 permanent settlements, ports, shipyards, warehouses, arable land, farms, vegetable gardens, hunting for animals, mining, marine exploration and hiking, experienced personnel - it was a whole world with an established and developed infrastructure.

The fur trade became the basis of RAC's commercial activity. And it steadily declined.

But why?

We already know why, but remember again!

At one time, Shelikhov and his people mined 2000 beavers, 40,000 fur seals, 6,000 blue foxes, 1,000 pounds of walrus tusks and 500 pounds of whalebone.

From 1797 to 1821, 72,894 sea beavers and 1,232,374 fur cats were taken.

And from 1842 to 1861 - 25,602 beavers and 338,604 cats.

Here it is, the price of non-Selrodo-flying conventions! And this is the price of being afraid to send to Russian America not only a Russian industrialist and merchant, but also a Russian soldier.

After all, the fishery was reduced not because of the mismanagement of the RAC, but because of the Yankees. And since the time Shelikhov and even Baranov, the situation has changed fundamentally even in a systemic sense.

And it is well characterized by a note from the chief ruler of the colonies, Muravyov, dated April 16, 1823

of the year.

"Before," Matvey Ivanovich wrote already then, "although there were some impudent Americans who stifled a colossus against the Russians, most of the captains of the ships and the most prudent ones found it very beneficial for themselves the existence of the Novo-Arkhangelsk fortress on the shores of NW America for more than one commercial species, but more so because this is the only place on the entire expanse of the Wth coast of America from the pole to the equator, where in case of any accident you can find both help and safety; there were many examples that they found in Sith the rescue..."

That is, at one time Novo-Arkhangelsk was the only civilized center for thousands of miles around. And as we surrendered our positions and strengthened the Yankees in Hawaii, in Canton (where they had nothing to do without Russian furs), the same Novo-Arkhangelsk became more and more a hindrance - precisely because of its Russian affiliation.

And we were no longer masters in our own house!

Well, where does it fit - in 1852, the first information about the presence of gold placers in

Russian possessions in Alaska (after all, it is there that the Jacklondon Yukon flows). And now Petersburg instructs Bodisko to collect information and consider possible steps to prevent the "invasion of modern Argonauts"...

But this already borders on insanity! Well, what kind of diplomatic steps will help against the bearded horde of greedy adventurers? Guns are required here - as part of the protection, albeit distant, but Russian territory.

And it was not necessary to look at Palestine, not to take care of the Serbs and Wallachians, but urgently transfer to Russian America, at least an infantry regiment on ships that have not yet been flooded in Sevastopol!

And the Russian Alaskan Golden Fleece - both in the form of "soft junk" and in the form of heavy nuggets would be well protected!

And for gold it would be possible to develop at least arable farming, at least military screw shipbuilding.

However, by the fifties it was already bad with the "junk" - the RAC more and more profited from the trade not in fur, but in tea. That is, from a fishing company, it turned into actually intermediary.

So, did Russian America become unnecessary for us? Well, first, when eliminating poaching it was possible to raise the fur income.

And after all, these lands also had geopolitical significance! As early as November 30, 1833, Pushkin made an entry in his diary about a conversation with Bligh, secretary of the English embassy. They were looking at a map of the gradual spread of Russia, and Bly, unable to bear it, threw out angrily: "How long will it take you to spread? Your fleet is a toy! Your place is in Asia, there you will make a worthy

feat of civilization ... "

Yes, Bligh saw the picture, unbearable for the British eye ... The Russian flag - and on the Pacific Ocean.

Here is a Frenchman of bad memory - the Marquis Astolfe de Custine, the author of the vile (but how often, alas, true) libel "La Russie en 1839", looking at Russian state couriers, angrily wrote: "These courier, who before my eyes every day rushing in all directions in the opulent capital, evoking in me the idea of those deserts (n-yes. -S.K.) where they are going. I mentally follow them to Siberia, to Kamchatka, to the Great Wall of China, to Lapland, to the Arctic Ocean, to Novaya Zemlya, to Persia, to the Caucasus."

The marquis-misanthrope did not forget to remember Novaya Zemlya, although there were no couriers there at that time - except to deliver dispatches to polar bears ... But in Novo-Arkhangelsk he was choked up ... Even the thought that Russian courier were carrying Russian decrees to Russian America, was unbearable for this frank hater of Russia ...

And RUSSIAN America was still Russian. Although during the Crimean War the first semi-official bell had already rung, the Russian-American Company and the Hudson's Bay Company concluded an agreement on the mutual "neutralization" of possessions for three years, although the KGZ in the American northwest did not actually have any possessions.

And at the suggestion of Eduard Stekl, who became a Russian chargé d'affaires in Washington in March 1854, a fictitious sale of all the property, crafts and privileges of the RAC on the territory of Russian America for 7 million 600 thousand dollars was even almost completed by a certain "American-Russian Trading Company" in San Francisco...

Let us remember this figure, at which the Company itself, and not the Russian possessions, was valued as such.

Newspapers in the United States began to argue that it was better for the tsar to cede Novo-Arkhangelsk Yankees than agree to be captured by the British.

And Stekl argued that it was these rumors that kept the British from hostile actions against Russian settlements.

N-yes.

But it seems to me that the British did not have so many forces in high latitudes, so that, having received teeth in Petropavlovsk, risk even in the area of the Alexander archipelago.

However, the first official sounding of the United States regarding Russia selling its American colonies.

Note that at that time it was only about directly American mainland lands. But still was ahead...

Russian America faced a cloudy and dark last decade...

On February 18 (March 2), 1855, Nicholas the First died in St. Petersburg ...

Fyodor Ivanovich Tyutchev composed a gloomy, not entirely fair, but historically, in general, true epitaph for him:

You did not serve God and not
Russia, You served only your
vanity, And all your deeds, both good and
evil, - Everything was a lie in you, all ghosts are
empty: You were not a king, but a hypocrite.

Nikolai was an outstanding person - who will argue. However, his most outstanding the trait was, perhaps, the limitedness, the organic *slowness* of nature.

Of course, he was not the only one who made mistakes in his foreign policy - the same Tyutchev was in the "Eastern question "is not more realistic than the king and, for example, on March 1, 1850 he wrote:

And the vaults of ancient Sophia,
In renewed Byzantium, Again
overshadow the altar of Christ. Fall
before him, O Tsar of Russia, - And rise
like the all-Slavic Tsar!

But Tyutchev, who thought in purely European terms and categories, was not an all-Russian autocrat. But it was, if you think about it, a damn interesting and exciting thing to stand at the head of Russia. Peter in this place, after all, heaped up something!

But Nikolai Pavlovich (although he really wanted to be like Peter) didn't even have a crumb state insolence of Peter Alekseevich ...

Yes, there were a lot of slanders against Nicholas ... Here is what Grand Duke Alexander Mikhailovich, whom I believe, said in his memoirs: "Leo Tolstoy specialized in exposing the "cruelties" of Emperor Nicholas I. Once my brother Nikolai Mikhailovich, a historian, in a long, strictly and in a courteous letter pointed out to Tolstoy the groundlessness of his ... accusations. And he received a curious answer from Yasnaya Polyana: Tolstoy recognized his "deepest respect for the patriotic

politics" on

his grandfather and thanked his brother for "interesting historical information." Meanwhile, no one

hindered the sale of Tolstoy's pamphlet..."

But after all, Taras Shevchenko was right when he spoke about the "unforgettable Brake" ...

And it was not in vain that Tyutchev wrote that "the suppression of thought was for many years the guiding principle of government...

And the result of the "patriotic policy" was the Peace of Paris in 1856.

Nikolai founded the Pulkovo Observatory and carried out a number of measures to support state support for science and engineering education, but his reign did not become the "starry time" of either Russian science or Russian industry.

Nikolai somehow dropped: "I don't need scientists, I need loyal subjects." And as a result, the diplomat Tyutchev wrote on July 23, 1854 to his second wife (the first died) Ernestina Tyutcheva that if he had not been "so poor", he would have openly broken with the ministry, "this bunch of cretins who

in spite of everything and on the ruins of the world that collapsed under the weight of their stupidity, condemned to live and die in complete impunity for his cretinism.

But Nicholas was gone. And the Russian throne was taken by his son Alexander II.

On April 15, 1856, Nesselrode left and his position was taken over by the fifty-eight-year-old Alexander Mikhailovich Gorchakov.

Did it change anything in essence?

Wouldn't say...

Nesselrode openly focused on Austria. Gorchakov was inclined towards orientation towards France.

But he was no longer inclined to focus on Russia in the highest metropolitan "state" circles almost no one...

And on March 22 (April 3), 1857, in a letter from Nice addressed to the new Minister of Foreign Affairs Gorchakov, the brother of the new emperor, Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolayevich, for the first time put into circulation the idea of selling the conquests of Chirikov and Sarychev, Izmailov and Tolstykh, Shelikhov and Baranov ... Launched on the highest "state" level ...

I will repeatedly mention and quote this document of vile august disbelief in the forces of Russia, and now I'll just report that by that time the Yankees were no longer holding back even in the original Russian waters.

Russian sailor lieutenant V.I. Zbyshevsky in 1863 in the "Sea Collection" (No. 4, part 4, part unofficial) after sailing on the Askold frigate and the Rynda corvette, he wrote about it this way:

One has to be surprised that such revealing lines could appear at least in the unofficial part of the official publication of the Naval Department, and I can explain the fact of their publication only by the fact that just then the struggle for Russian America inside Russia was entering its decisive and final phase, and there were honest Russian people who, at least in this way, tried to

then influence the situation.

Alas, it was not possible to get through to the brilliantly polished crowned foreheads of the Romanov brothers. either formally or informally...

At that time, they equipped Lesovsky and Popov's demonstration expeditions to the Atlantic shores of North America to support the United States and allegedly to threaten British and French trade. shipping.

What the hell are we in it, in this shipping, if the threat to Russia was expanding from the other side

The American continent is on the Pacific Ocean, and it came from the USA.

And instead, the Russian squadrons saved the Yankees and thereby caused tears of happiness in the mother of Miron Gerrik
- an American friend of Grand Duke Alexander Mikhailovich ...

The Russian Pacific sailors, on the other hand, could hardly hold back their angry tears from the impossibility of teaching the "most
free" insolent from the "freest country" ...

Chapter 8

How they sold Alaska to the Romanov bar...

In a HUGE, more than five hundred pages, article about Emperor Alexander II in the Russian Biographical Dictionary of the 1896 edition, 16 (sixteen) words are said about Russian America on pages 662-663, and in this context:

"In the course of 1867, the following took place: the treaty signed in St. Petersburg on March 18 (in reality it was signed on April 18 (30) in Washington, which is why it is sometimes called Washington. - S.K.), to which Russia ceded to the United States its *possessions* in North America, and the erection of Prince AM Gorchakov on June 15, the day of the fiftieth anniversary of his service, to the dignity of State Chancellor. Meanwhile, the armed uprising that broke out on the island of Crete again attracted the attention of the Imperial Cabinet to the East ... "

So, the sale of Russian America was regarded by the authors of the Dictionary (and it was, after all, published by the Imperial Russian Historical Society!) as an event equivalent in importance to the elevation to the chancellorship of Prince Gorchakov ...

In 1867, in addition to our mainland possessions in America, we surrendered the Aleutian Islands, the islands Pribylov, the islands of St. Matthew and St. Lawrence, the archipelago of Alexander (First).

And so the "rebellion" on the island of Crete, it turns out, was a matter for the imperial cabinet Alexander II more important. No, they don't talk, they don't talk about the rope in the hanged man's house ...

But we will have to talk ... And not about the island of Crete, but about the critical situation in which official Russia fell in the sixties with that almost phlegmatic calm that was so characteristic of the two most august Romanov brothers - Alexander and Konstantin Nikolaevich.

NO, everything looked decent on the outside. Of course, at the beginning of the reign of Alexander II, the shadow of defeat in the Crimean War immediately fell. The Treaty of Paris in 1856 denied Russia the right to a powerful Black Sea Fleet. But could someone deny Russia the right not only to be considered, but also to be a great power?

The "liberation" of the peasants without land by the Manifesto of February 19, 1861 took place relatively smoothly, and the now "post-reform" Russian Empire moved on.

Even before the "liberation" - in 1860, the State Bank was founded.

In the same year, Vladivostok was also founded.

And in the same year, the World Union of Israelites was founded, created by Isaac-Adolf Crémier under patronage of the Rothschild banking house.

And Baron Lionel Nathan Rothschild at that time became the financial agent of the Russian governments abroad and actively operated in the field of Russian railway loans.

If Count Kankrin believed that Russia could do without railways, then Sir Lionel, on the contrary, believed that Russia would have no future without them. He generally liked the means of communication, this restless baron. He also financed the purchase of the Suez Canal by England (I will keep silent about his personal "fat" with such a love for victories over time and space).

And - there is no evil without good! Having received not so much a good beating as a ringing "Crimean" slap in the face

for its stupid activity in the "Eastern" question, which was beneficial only to the British, Russia seemed to temporarily take up its mind and turned its attention to the "Asiatic" question - that the British were more what is unfavorable...

Already by the middle of the 19th century, Nikolaev Russia occupied the Trans-Ili region, and a little later the Syr-Darya line was established. At the same time, the Russian fortification Vernoye (the future Alma-Ata) was advanced from the side of Siberia towards Central Asia, and Fort Perovsky held the line from the side of Orenburg.

During the time of Alexander II, it was decided to connect them with a new cordon line, and in May 1864 two detachments moved towards each other ... 2,500 people under the command of Colonel Chernyaev set out from Verny, and 1,500 people under the command of Colonel Verevkin - from Fort Perovsky.

Chernyaev occupied the Kokand fortress of Aulie-Ata from battle, Verevkin - the town of Turkestan, and then, united, on September 22 they took Shymkent by attack. Thus, the Novo-Kokand line was already established, covering the outlying Russian regions from raids from Khiva, Bukhara and Kokand.

Our detachments had to fight mainly with heat and distance, and this struggle was no less successful than the overall result - the average daily rate of movement of the detachments reached fifty kilometers. And this is a lot and in milder conditions.

Gorchakov, who had not yet been elevated to chancellorship, informed the foreign powers of Russia's new acquisitions in a lengthy circular, in which at first it was rightly noted that *"the greatest difficulty lies in the ability to stop,"* and then it was explained that the goal of Emperor Alexander *"is not to expand, beyond all reasonable measure, the borders of the lands subject to his scepter, but to establish his authority in them on solid grounds, ensure their safety and develop in them a social order, trade, prosperity and civilization."*

Although tactically Gorchakov later took a line that was not very smart (he began to prematurely declare that Russia would not move further at all, which was simply geopolitically impossible), strategically everything was right - all Russia needed was to withdraw to the limits of reason, without going over them ...

But where are these limits?

The desert lands from Verny-Alma-Ata, from Lake Issyk-Kul through the Aral to the Caspian and between the Aral and the Caspian were a natural buffer zone for Russia and belonged to it from any point of view. The nomads on these lands had an inalienable right to live on them and feed from them. However, in the world rapidly colonized by Europeans, such a right of aborigines was ensured precisely when incorporation of their lands into Russia.

Everything was clear with the steppes, but there was still a densely populated and ancient zone of the Khiva Khanate, the Emirate of Bukhara, Kokand and Fergana.

Being guided by the logic of geopolitics means being able to stop in time. And Gorchakov seemed to think here quite nationally and in line with the Russian geopolitical idea - to move no further than the natural Russian borders.

Such borders in the south and southeast were the mountains - the Caucasus, Kopetdag, Hindu Kush, Pamir, Tien Shan, Altai ... If we look at the map of Russia of Nicholas II, we will see that by the beginning of the 20th century, the Russians had reached these mountainous geopolitical boundaries and they did not go further.

By the 70s of the 19th century, they still had to be reached, because the Novo-Kokand line was inevitably intermediate - the British from India were already actively infiltrating into the zone between it and the mountain ranges.

Therefore, the question of maintaining the former status of the Central Asian khanates was not raised. The dilemma was this: either these khanates would somehow enter the sphere of state existence of Russia, or they would be subordinated to England (today the place of Britain in this dilemma has already been taken by the United States).

The integration of the whole of Central Asia with Russia was therefore a foregone conclusion. But - nothing more than the integration of Central Asia. And for this, Russia had only to move forward - to ensure the security of the main national territory.

That is, for Russia it was one of the most important issues of peaceful national development.

England, on the other hand, wanted to infiltrate and gain a foothold on the next lands, separated from the English Isle far away lands, seas and mountains (as now - the USA) ...

It made no sense for Russia to move further than the mountains, however, according to the golden principle of the English gentleman "Accused before they accuse you", London suddenly began to "worry" about the fate of its East Indian possessions lying beyond the mountains.

Already in 1865, the St. James cabinet turned to the Russian court with a proposal to exchange notes to clarify the mutual position of both powers in Central Asia. Russia reasonably refused - only such a state of affairs could be geopolitically justified when Russia includes Central Asia, and not as a colony, but as a new element of a national state, and England willy-nilly recognizes this fact and does not try to acquire in Central Asia new overseas colonies from Zagorsk... It was impossible for Russia not to come to Central Asia, and England had simply nothing to do in Central Asia.

But the British did not calm down. Moreover, Adjutant General von Kaufmann successfully conducted his Turkestan expedition and had already reached Samarkand.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lord Clarendon, began probing whether, as he wrote to Gorchakov, "in order to calm public opinion in England (oh, this is a powerful opinion! - S.K.) and prevent disagreements and complications, agree on the creation of mutual possessions in this parts of Asia of the neutral zone, which would protect them from any accidental contact"?

Clarendon pointed to Afghanistan as such a possible zone.

Gorchakov immediately agreed and instructed the Russian ambassador in London, Brunnov, to announce that such an option "is perfectly in line with the views and intentions of the Imperial Cabinet", that "His Imperial Majesty considers Afghanistan completely outside the sphere in which Russia can be called upon to exercise its influence", and that "no interference contrary to the independence of Afghanistan, is not part of Russian intentions."

So, the possible conflict is settled?

Uh, the English gentleman is master of his word! Times Clarendon offered as a buffer independent zone of Afghanistan himself, then he himself can refuse his own proposal?

He refused!

And he proposed to draw a dividing line along ... Amu-Darya! No more and no less!

That is, "worried" about how the Russians would not reach the sources of the Indus, the British brazenly climbed into Central Asia itself, counting on Khiva and access to the Caspian Sea ...

N-yes...

But then the sons of Britain did not break off! Fight on land with the Russians, and even at extremely unfavorable communication environment, it was a disastrous affair.

On the other hand, the occupation of Central Asia turned out to be almost bloodless for Russia. During the capture of Tashkent, 125 people were killed and wounded, Khojent - 140. The campaign of 1868 to conquer the Zeravshan district, according to the authors of the report about it, "cost our troops dearly", and at the same time it was about 250 wounded and 100 killed ... The total number of those killed in the Central Asian military expeditions was approximately 2 thousand people over more than thirty years. That is, there was no fierce struggle, because there was no cruelty on the part of the Russians.

Yes, the Central Asian line of Russian policy was quite reasonable, geopolitically justified and nationally wealthy.

The Far Eastern policy in the Amur zone also began to improve - albeit with a creak. Through the efforts Muravyov-Amursky and his associates, Russia got its own Far East.

As for Russian America, it turned out to be doomed, for it was betrayed even before was sold...

In the ALREADY mentioned letter to Gorchakov dated March 22 (April 3), 1857 from Nice, General Admiral and patron of the Naval Ministry, Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolayevich, referring to the "cramped position of state finances" and the need to finance the development of the Russian fleet, proposed to improve the situation by selling Russian America .

Well, the guillotine relieves headaches, but the doctors who recommend it as a remedy treatment, only such "treatment" is worthy!

The problem of the fleet, of course, existed. The Crimean War put an end to the whole world, not only in the sailing fleet, but also in the wooden fleet. By the beginning of the sixties, the first battleships in France and England were commissioned, in America, iron monitors were about to make themselves impressive during the Civil War of the North and South ...

By that time, Russia was lagging behind the West more and more. If even in Alexander's times (not to mention Catherine's) a comparison of the industrial and technological development of Russia and France, America, and England did not give serious grounds for national shame, then by the second half of the fifties the picture was already changing ... Although not so depressing, as we are often told.

No doubt - foreign armor was better. And, as the current historians of the fleet write, having received from England information about the testing of armor plates there and the laying of seaworthy battleships in 1858, Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolayevich, who patronized the Naval Ministry, raised the issue of such studies in Russia directly to Alexander II.

On paper it looks impressive, but in reality? Let's say, what was the cost of this "selfless" grand ducal appeal "directly" to the "autocrat"? And absolutely nothing! Just something at the next dinner after returning from "Europe" to say:

Dearest Sasha! Inspection of the English ships was not useless ... We spied on the same a lot of good and practical things... We should too...

And hear in response:

— Yes, you are right... We have shipbuilding since childhood...

- Exactly...

- Yes ... And in general, we still have a lot to learn ...

Yes! Necessary...

So historians again confirm that chronic, they say, financial difficulties and

the lack of factories capable of manufacturing armor hindered the development of a modern military in Russia shipbuilding.

But what there "difficulties"! They were. But - by no means financial!

Here are some numbers...

In 1860, 30 thousand rubles were allocated for the purchase of machine tools for the Admiralty Izhora factories.

At the Kronstadt steamship plant, new equipment "pulled" as much as 47.3 thousand rubles.

And "whole" 19 thousand were spent on the construction of a test site for testing already domestic plates on the Volkovo field next to the Izhora factories ...

In Russia at that time there were more than a hundred thousand landowners. The average landowner owned about six hundred tithes at an average price of 70 rubles. Total - forty-two thousand rubles.

That is, when the backlog from the advanced world level of metallurgy and shipbuilding was revealed, the Russia of Alexander II paid off an amount to close the gap that did not amount to the cost of three middle-class estates!

Given that the largest Russian landowner was the royal family itself, at the disposal which had 860 thousand revision souls and more than 9 million acres of land in twenty provinces, then ...

However, multiply and divide yourself, my dear reader!

But this is so, the reasoning is speculative. But a specific historical fact relating just by the time of the sale of Russian America.

In the second half of August 1867, Fyodor Ivanovich Tyutchev wrote to his daughter from his second marriage, Maria Fedorovna Birileva (Tyutcheva):

Alexander Petrovich Melnikov was an adviser to the court stable office and father-in-law Tyutchev, so you can trust this information.

I will add that at the same time, the English industrialist Hughes received in the emerging Donets Basin from the tsarist government a free land plot with coal deposits and half a million rubles. loans...

It's good, of course, that those half a million went to work. But why Yuz? Russian After all, the government had enough of its brilliant organizers and metallurgists!

Pavel Petrovich Anosov, his student Pavel Matveyevich Obukhov, Obukhov's student - Dmitry Konstantinovich Chernov ... These are only the grandees of Russian practical metallurgy and metallurgical science of that time. But they were not single enthusiasts, but leaders of schools, industrial teams...

Eh!

We could, we could have both armor plates and armored warships in time! And have them without sales of Russian America!

Already much later than the time of the sale, a retired naval officer, publicist Mikhail Osipovich Menshikov wrote in 1905: *"We have no colonies, no commercial fleet - yes, but perhaps only because they do not exist because there is no power on the seas. If, according to the plan of Peter the Great, we developed a serious sea power, if we took part in the division of the land together with the Western powers, then we would have our own exotic colonies, and with them there would be something to carry, there would also be a commercial*

fleet. Peter equipped expeditions to Madagascar and the Pacific Ocean ... "

Menshikov is an ambiguous thinker and figure, but you cannot refuse him love for Russia. And if love is blind, it is only in a personal sense, but true love for the Motherland sometimes makes a person surprisingly perspicacious. And here I completely agree with Mikhail Osipovich - by the second half of the 19th century we needed a powerful and modern fleet.

But - not in the Baltic against Germany or on the Black Sea, it is not clear against whom. In Europe we minefields and coastal batteries would be quite enough.

We needed a fleet in the Pacific Ocean to neutralize the encroachments of the Yankees on our part of America ... Why did we have to take part in the "division of lands" that are not continentally adjacent to Russia, when we already had such vast lands?

We just had to keep them behind us, and that's all...

And WE, at the suggestion of no one knows who, missed them ... Konstantin - it was, after all, the most august screen. And behind it were hiding those whom even the loyal Tyutchev wrote about as "a gang of people who weigh so heavily on Russia with impunity and disgrace the sovereign", as "a despicable clique that now enjoys influence", and, finally, as "the dregs of the Russian society", "anti-Russian offspring"...

Of course, the sale of Russian America cannot be explained by the intrigues of the "anti-Russian offspring" alone. And among those who in one way or another contributed to the loss of Russia's American possessions, there were obviously people and very worthy ones ... Let's say, Muravyov-Amursky did not behave in the best way here, and even Ferdinand Petrovich Wrangel was not always and not at his best .

But it is essential that there were many dark intrigues and dark personalities around the idea of selling. They, who did not get into the protocols, dispatches and monographs, played, I think, considerable, but rather everything is a decisive role.

They set that general state (more precisely, anti-state) tone, which the two the august brothers could only endure.

What, I must say, did they do ...

Thus, Konstantin's letter to Gorchakov, written in the spring of 1857 from Nice, had a prehistory that began in the winter of that year - when Konstantin in the same Nice received a note from a certain Tengoborsky on the state of Russia's finances after the Crimean War and "immediately reduced expenses on maritime department...

Why all of a sudden? The Pole Ludwig Valerianovich Tengoborsky, who started his official career in the Kingdom of Poland, was, of course, a well-known economist and statistician. But after all, he was not the Minister of Finance, but only a member of the State Council and Chairman of the Tariff Committee, oversaw foreign trade.

Yes, he wrote a major four-volume work on economic statistics "On the Productive Forces of Russia", but this work was first published in Paris in French, in 1852-1855 (that is, when the Crimean War was still going on) and only in 1854-1858 was published in Russian. So it is still not clear what the former Polish referendary, the former consul general in Danzig and the former plenipotentiary commissioner in Vienna were doing there - economic science or open economic intelligence in favor of Russia's enemies?

And for some reason, everything in the business of selling Russian America began with Tengoborsky. And for some reason just in 1857 he died. And he was not so old - sixty-four years old. Did not suffer from excesses ...

What - there were no sensible advisers besides tengobors? Were! But for some reason they didn't even listen.
when their opinion reached royal ears.

Prince Pyotr Alekseevich Kropotkin, who lived a long life, a geographer, geologist and theorist of anarchism, who nevertheless moved in high circles, wrote in his Notes of a Revolutionary: "I had to hear that Alexander II made a big mistake, causing so many expectations, which later did *not* could satisfy ... Alexander II did something worse. Yielding to the current for a while, he prompted people all over Russia to get down to building work ... And yet, out of fear of doing something, everyone left it as it was. Thirty-five years have placed in the category of "suspicious" all those who dared

notice that changes are needed ... "

Well, here the anarchist principle let the prince down a bit - if everything were like that, then Russia would just collapse. But she nevertheless went forward, even with weights of idiocy and insanity on her feet.

And there were always those who dared in it - in spite of everything! Here is an example from the times at the turning point reigns of Nicholas I and Alexander II...

Pyotr Vasilyevich Kazakevich (Kozakevich) and Alexander Yegorovich Kroun ...

Both at the end of their careers are admirals (the first is full, the second is vice). And in the mid-1950s, when they were sent to the United States to purchase ships and the "machine institution" of the Nikolaev Steamship Plant, Kazakevich (he was older, about forty years old) was in the rank of captain of the 1st rank, and Crown - lieutenant commander.

These officers were experienced, with good life and seafaring skills, both were world travelers, both rounded Cape Horn ... Kazakevich sailed as a senior officer on Nevelsky's Baikal to the Amur. Crown's grandfather - a native of Scotland, was accepted into the Russian service back in Catherine's times, rose to the rank of admiral and was, as sailors say, "happy with fair winds", raised

many good sailors...

So, from the authorities, Kazakevich and Crown received very broad powers - to act in procurement "at their own discretion, without any limitation in amounts, but in compliance with the state interest"...

And they kept it! But how!

Purchased ships and equipment for 1,276,316 rubles 30 kopecks.

And this was the case when the pennies - I'm sure of that - were by no means affixed for the formal "openwork".

Let the reader judge for himself...

The "Japanets" transport bought by Captain-Lieutenant Crown cost the treasury 445,069 rubles 74 pennies. And rear-admiral Shants bought the ship Kamchatka, which was close in class, for 736,776 rubles.

For the Manchurian transport, Crown paid 259,215 rubles 23 and a half kopecks, and for a similar Finnish-built clipper, the Horseman, and the Bayan corvette, built in Bordeaux, they paid 306,197 and 415,717 rubles.

Kazakevich cheaply bought the steamships America and Amur, and the barge Lena for only 47,525 rubles 25 kopecks.

True, despite the obvious savings and benefits, the officials of the Shipbuilding Department approved the expenses made only three years after the purchases - at the end of December 1859. It is seen, they couldn't believe that they could steal, but they didn't.

And this is sad... And the fact that the Russia of Alexander II gave a serious chance to thievish trenches, and not

dashing Cossacks.

And the saddest thing is that Russia has already had to buy machine-building equipment and ships in the United States - in a country that until recently was an agricultural ...

The GREAT Prince Konstantin, General-Admiral of the Russian Navy, hung out abroad for months. Moreover, he amused himself with the contemplation of the dead ancient and living crowned ruins, traveled ... Instead of intensely delving into the matter that he was supposedly entrusted with maritime power of the state.

And on April 2, 1859, in Naples, after a trip to Capo-di-Monte and before a trip to Aquila's villa, he melancholy wrote in his diary: " *Yesterday a courier arrived from St. Petersburg. I sit and read papers. We have cut off 1.300.000 from the maritime budget. This is a colossal beastliness, for which, of course, they took advantage of my absence. Went with a woman to Capo-di-Monte.*

By this time, Konstantin had been abroad for six months, but for inspections of foreign shipyards and I didn't spend even a week of ships! He did not reach the factories at all.

Yes, this is not "Peter the Carpenter of Saardam" for you ...

But on October 13, 1858, he spent half a day inspecting the quarter of the famous Hamburg dens: "*After lunch with Gaurowitz and Kudryavsky, we went to see the famous streets. A terrible sight and a terrible impression.*

By the way, neglecting his duties, Konstantin actually became a state criminal, because in the Russian-Turkish war of 1777-1778, Russia, unlike the advanced maritime powers, did not have a modern fleet. And the Special Meeting, convened in 1881 after the death of Alexander II from the bomb of the "Narodnaya Volya", to determine the strategic tasks and the shipbuilding program, defined the state of the Russian fleet as "stagnation and weakness."

The official biographers of Konstantin excitedly talk about his concern for the fleet, citing his supposedly dominant principle: "Major navigation of warships in distant seas and oceans is possible, which is necessary both to create true sailors and to maintain international significance.

Russia".

The principle is excellent and patriotic, but, firstly, just the fact that Russia has its Russian America provided practical support for this principle, and Konstantin deprived Russia of Russian America.

Secondly, I will give an extract from the letter of Tsarevich Alexander, written by him 11 (23) September 1879 to Pobedonostsev:

"I am very sorry that the Naval Ministry is sending officers and teams away from us (meaning the Volunteer Fleet, which was conceived as a reserve of the military fleet and patronized by the Tsarevich, which I will say more about. - S.K.), this is very sad and unpleasant.

I absolutely do not understand their calculation, since they constantly have extra people on the shore who do not see anything marine and do not see anything in their entire service. Nothing can be done about such a stupid and hostile ministry ... The Admiral-General does what others drive into his head. It just takes anger to deal with people like that."

This is a nephew - the future emperor - so evaluates his uncle after the latter's stay on post of Admiral General for formally forty-eight, but in fact - twenty-four years!

And this assessment is deadly.

But no! There are lovers not to see the obvious. And in the military-historical reference book

"The Russian Imperial Fleet", published on the occasion of the 300th anniversary of the Russian fleet in 1993, about the Grand Duke Konstantin neo-"loyal" reported: history of Konstantin Nikolaevich.

N-yes...

This "talented reformer", born in 1827, was appointed admiral general at the age of ... four years (which in itself was a profanity), he received his first officer rank of midshipman at his birthday at seven, and by adulthood, in 1847, rose to the rank of Rear Admiral.

His tutor was the famous Admiral Fyodor Petrovich Litke, mathematics and physics were taught by academician Lenz, military sciences were taught by four colonels, a major general and a rear admiral. However, the nature of their august disciple was typically grand-ducal, that is, superficial ... Eight years before the Crimean disgrace of the autocracy, at the age of 19, he presented a note "Assumption of an attack on Tsar-grad from the sea", where he famously took Constantinople on paper by the forces of the Black Sea Fleet (which was possible in reality from the side of the land) and no less famously reflected - on paper - "all sorts of attempts by the fleets of England and France to knock us out of Constantinople" ... But in reality, the fleet of the father "Admiral General" could not protect even Sevastopol from the Anglo-French.

After the death of Nicholas I, having received the opportunity to play "soldiers and sailors" together with his brother-emperor without restrictions, on June 24, 1857, Konstantin wrote to Prince A.I. Baryatinsky: *"It is necessary to find new and, moreover, colossal sources of national wealth, so that Russia can catch up with other states in this regard ..."*

But the Romanovs did not see any sources for the amendment of state affairs, except for new external debts from the Rothschilds, the sale of the national territory to the Yankees and the transfer of state-owned Ural mining plants to private hands ...

Konstantin did not see either the potential wealth of Russia, or the talent of a Russian person, even in the educated part of it, and wrote to the same Baryatinsky: *"We are both weaker and poorer than the paramount powers ... moreover, poorer not only in material ways, but also in mental strength, especially in the administration."*

Eh!

In order to understand what a person is, it is not necessary to find out who his friend is. You can ask, after all: who is his enemy?

So, for a more complete characterization of Konstantin Romanov Sr. (there was also his son Konstantin, poet "K.R."), I will talk about his personal enemy Nikolai Mikhailovich Baranov ...

The fact that Baranov was precisely the personal enemy of the Grand Duke is reported by General Yepanchin from the words of his son "Admiral General", the same poet.

And here is what I will inform the reader in addition ...

BARANOV entered the Navy at the age of eighteen - in 1854. In the Russo-Turkish War, he commanded the Vesta steamship and on July 11, 1877, off the coast of Rumelia, he withstood a five-hour pursuit of the Turkish battleship Fekhti-Bulend, conducting an artillery battle all this time and losing 2 officers and 9 sailors killed and 5 officers and 15 sailors wounded (this is a lot for a naval battle).

Baranov's assistant on the Vesta was, among other things, the young Zinovy Rozhdestvensky, the future commander of the 2nd Pacific squadron, which ended its long journey from Kronstadt at the bottom of the Tsushima Strait.

Baranov famously fought and then took the prize of the Turkish ship "Mersina" with a landing force of 800 people ... However, even then he had ill-wishers, and there was a rumor about an "imaginary battle" with the Fekhti-Buland. Baranov, as a straight man, himself demanded an investigation and trial of himself. At the same time, a conflict arose with the payment of compensation for the rise of a certain ship.

Konstantin did not need such officers in the navy. And, taking advantage of a convenient occasion, with The Baranovs were simply dealt with.

On September 2 (14), 1879, Tsarevich Alexander (the future Alexander the Third) wrote to his former mentor Konstantin Petrovich Pobedonostsev from Bernstorf: *"We can express how sad the story of N.M. Baranov. I don't know what I would have done in his place, but the truth is, his life was becoming impossible. And I understand that it is possible to bring any person to despair if they treat him as they treat N.M. Baranov at the present time."*

And on January 15, the Russian style of 1880, Alexander informed the same addressee: *"Yesterday, the fate of Baranov was decided. The sovereign mitigated the punishment by dismissal from service instead of the sentence presented: exclusion from service ... It was very difficult for the sovereign to decide to dismiss Baranov. Konstantin Nikolaevich - he is dissatisfied even with the fact that the sovereign mitigated the punishment."*

Having started a story with an accusation, Constantine could not help but bring it to the end, and the king could not put it on all this history is a cross. Otherwise, as the same crown prince wrote, "the trial would have turned into some kind of comedy."

Baranov was forced to resign, after which he went through the administrative line - he served as the Kovno governor, in 1881 he was the capital's mayor, and then - the Arkhangelsk and Nizhny Novgorod governor.

In St. Petersburg, during his tenure as governor, he established a council elected from the townspeople (Baranov's enemies evily nicknamed him "sheep's parliament"). One of the contemporaries of the era gave the following picture of this undertaking: *"Baranov arranged meetings of homeowners and tenants, gave them various questions for discussion, which the police authorities could hardly give for their discussion. In any case, this way of doing business was unusual for Russia, especially in those days."*

Baranov became one of the initiators of the creation of Dobroflot, a maritime shipping society established on voluntary donations with the aim of developing Russian merchant shipping and creating a reserve of the navy (on this basis, he agreed with Pobedonostsev).

His behavior in Nizhny Novgorod during the next cholera epidemic is characteristic: when the cholera barracks were full of patients, he immediately took his governor's house under the cholera hospital and insisted that the newspapers print accurate information about the course of the epidemic, while as in other cities everything was hidden.

He died in 1901 with the rank of lieutenant general, and in his memory one of the Black Sea destroyers bore the name "Captain Lieutenant Baranov".

During his life, Baranov, as I understand it, annoyed every bastard a lot, and therefore this bastard also spawned a lot of tales about him ... And here Sergei Yulievich Witte enters my story for the first time, who in his extremely tendentious "Memoirs" did not ignore Baranov ...

Witte, as an essentially unscrupulous figure, treated Nikolai Mikhailovich exactly as a person like Witte can and should treat a person like Baranov, that is, hostilely. And that is precisely why Witte's positive evidence can be trusted.

"When I arrived in Nizhny Novgorod," he recalled, "there the governor was General Baranov, a former naval officer, known either for his feat or buffoonery. Some say it was

feat, others claim that it was a buffoonery ... Judging by Baranov's reports, our ship "Vesta" put up a heroic resistance ... How right are those who say that the Vesta accomplished a truly outstanding military feat, or those who say that it is it was more of a buffoonery (in which the loss of a small crew amounted to 31 people killed and wounded. - S.K.) than a feat, of course, it is rather difficult to judge, because only those who were on the Vesta at that time were witnesses of this ...

But since I was in Odessa at that time and heard a lot about it, then ... I got the impression that ... the ship "Vesta" ... under the command of Baranov really had to a certain extent (yes. - S.K.) heroism..."

I think Witte knew everything perfectly (what a "buffoonery" there is with such heavy combat losses!), But at least somehow he wanted to belittle the significance of Baranov's feat, without, in this case, descending to direct slander. It can be seen that Baranov's direct slander could have hit the "memoirist" himself with a boomerang, and therefore all the other assessments of Nikolai Mikhailovich Witte made with such a reservation. Like, Baranov "was a very smart, dexterous man, a master of speaking, very resourceful," but "he seemed to me not to have particularly firm moral rules (this is Witte, the embodiment of human and social unscrupulousness, he wrote such a thing! -S.K.) "; Baranov, they say, "in general, he's not a bad person, he didn't do anything especially bad," however, they say, "a great careerist" ...

Witte complained that when he came on an inspection visit to Nizhny during cholera, Baranov wanted to "laugh" at him ... But he was immediately forced to admit: "I saw Baranov very active; in general, he was the only governor who really took an active part in all this disaster and influenced the course of the epidemic. There was nothing like it in Samara or Saratov. In a word, he was a truly managerial governor, and therefore the population treated him with trust and gratitude.

Of course, Baranov was a man of his time. In 1880, on the instructions of the "dictator of the heart" Prince Loris-Melikov, he traveled abroad to organize supervision of Russian revolutionaries and, in his political views, did not rise above bourgeois liberalism. Baranov failed to see the potential of an orientation towards a Russo-German rather than a Russo-French alliance, and wrote in 1890: "The Russian does not want and will not go to Bismarck."

Well, well, not everyone can see far ahead. But Baranov loved Russia and never made serving her a lucrative occupation.

Sytin's Military Encyclopedia writes about Nikolai Mikhailovich as follows: "For all his talent, rare energy, great initiative and individuality, Baranov was a failure. He was put forward by exceptional circumstances: war, troubled times, cholera epidemics ... There were many character traits in Baranov, akin to SO. Makarov, whose career began at the same time, at the same military Black Sea theater, with the same dizzying speed. Both of them were hard workers, inventors in the best sense of the word, real military people, born administrators and commanders. In N. Novgorod, Baranov was not called an eagle for nothing; they said that he was acting "outside the law", but they listened and carried out his orders, because they knew that Baranov always took responsibility and knew how to protect his subordinates ... A man with an iron will in matters to which he attached state importance, Baranov in private life was a gentle and unusually kind person. Full of debt, pawning his own belongings, he helped not only acquaintances, but even more often his subordinates ... Having a perfect command of the pen, he spoke in periodicals at different times and on various issues ... Baranov himself believed and knew how to convince others that the truth saves , and lies and deceit always only destroy ... "

And such a sparkling Russian eagle was listed among Konstantin's enemies. Are there any further explanations needed here?

Perhaps yes...

The main dot over the "i" in the conflict between Baranov and Konstantin was put very boldly and clearly, and I will also convey this episode in the exposition of Witte:

"Baranov wrote various articles criticizing our fleet and the actions of the Naval Ministry in general (Witte admitted that the articles were very biting and smart, but Witte would not have been if he had not seen behind this only the desire of the author of the articles "to push some of those in power in the Naval Ministry and sit in their place. " - S.K.) ... And then one day, when Baranov, having written one of such very harsh articles (under a pseudonym. - S.K.) ... appeared to the Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolayevich, this latter during reception in the presence of other persons asked Captain Baranov: did he write the article or not? When Baranov replied that the article was written by him, the Grand Duke told him something like that only a scoundrel could write such an article, to which Baranov replied:

"Your Imperial Highness, I don't know how I should respond to someone who would say such a word to me, but I don't respond to insults only to two categories of people, namely: French

cocottes and grand dukes.

And here no additional explanations are required for sure! Nikolai Baranov finally became a mortal enemy for the Grand Duke.

And what about Alexander II himself?

Well, he, for one, was certainly a personally courageous person. The same Kropotkin, from the words of a bear-catcher saved by the tsar, reports that once, when a bear, not killed by Alexander's first shot, crushed a hunter who rushed to the rescue with a horn, the tsar now himself went to the rescue and shot the bear at close range.

So what? Melt with tenderness?

No, please! The autocrat, who is solely responsible for the state, requires, first of all, a different kind of courage - the courage of the state plan and the determination to translate it into action. But this kind of courage in the king was not observed.

He was a kind of somewhat phlegmatic charmer, an imposing Russian gentleman of average hands, average intelligence, average tastes and even average depravity (which forced him to order pornographic pictures to the court artist Zichy) ...

He also had hobbies of a Russian master - hunting, cards and women ...

And he headed a huge state at one of the important turning points of its historical existence.

Here are some more assessments of Kropotkin (and you can trust them - despite the anarchist "twists", Prince had an excellent memory, a clear mind and high connections):

"Everywhere in the ministries, especially in the construction of railways and in all kinds of contracts, robbery went on a big footing. The fleet, as Alexander II himself said to one of his sons, was "in the pockets of such and such." The construction of government-guaranteed railways was fabulously expensive ...

One of my acquaintances wanted to establish a commercial enterprise in St. Petersburg... He was directly told in the Ministry of Internal Affairs that 25% of the net profit should be given to one official of this ministry, 15% to one employee in the Ministry of Finance, 10% to another official

the same ministry, and 5% to another. Such transactions were made openly, and Alexander II was well aware of them. This is evidenced by his handwritten notes on the margins of the reports of the State Comptroller ...

It has been proven many times that the rural clergy are so busy with trebles that they cannot devote time to public schools ... Nevertheless, the higher clergy, taking advantage of Alexander II's hatred for the so-called revolutionary spirit, began a campaign with ... the slogan "either a parish school or none" ...

All of Russia wanted real schools; but the ministry opened only classical gymnasiums...

Technical education - in a country that needed engineers, agronomists and geologists - was seen as something revolutionary ... Every year, several thousand young people did not get into higher technical educational institutions due to a lack of vacancies.

This is what the original "ideological" base was like, on which the most august sales projects were built Russian America.

In a LETTER from Nice in 1857, Constantine wrote: *"This sale would be very timely, because one should not deceive oneself and one must foresee that the United States, constantly striving to round off its possessions and wanting to dominate indivisibly in North America, will take (! - C .K.) we have the mentioned colonies, and we will not be able to return them. Meanwhile, these colonies are of very little use to us, and the loss of them would not be too sensitive and would require only a reward from our Russian-American company. For the immediate discussion of this matter and calculation of the value of the colonies (but it has already been said that there is no use for them, so what to calculate? - S.K.), it would seem useful to demand detailed considerations of the former rulers of the colonies: Admiral Baron Wrangel, Rear Admiral Tebenkov and retired Rear Admiral Etolin, who are in St. Petersburg, bearing in mind, however, that they all can have a somewhat biased look as members of the American Company and, moreover, as persons who spent the best years of their lives in the colonies, where they enjoyed great power and importance.*

N-yes! It turned out that Admiral General Konstantin offered to use the experience of former rulers of Russian America and immediately accused his admirals of bias.

And not very clear, and not very beautiful.

Especially in relation to Wrangel, the former naval minister, who, presumably, enjoyed more power and significance in St. Petersburg than the devil in the middle of nowhere in Russian America. Yes, and the director of the Shipbuilding Department of the Naval Ministry, Tebenkov, was also in the Russian capital, as I understand it, not entirely without power and significance.

But it's still okay!

Here, in general, every word is a question. Where did the Grand Duke, if he traveled further than Nice, then only to London, did the opinion arise that the colonies were of little use? Has he been there?

So, someone oriented him accordingly? But who? Although he himself mentioned competent experts (and all of them were his subordinates, all of them from the maritime department), he did not involve them for his information before writing a most serious letter.

Although, it would seem, it was necessary first to consult with knowledgeable people, and only then to pull through Gorchakov's brother-tsar (it was for this purpose that the letter was written). Konstantin was not so bright mind, but in order to do so, a special mind is not needed. A minimum of common sense and a minimum sense of responsibility are enough. Yes, and decency.

Ah, yes! The admirals were in Russia, and the Grand Duke had been hanging out in Nice for a long time!

But who in this Nice advised him then about the amendment of Russian finances through the sale of Russian colonies? Yes, and assured of their absolute futility?

A?

And one more thing to say here...

N.N. Bolkhovitinov, who cites this letter in the 1990 monograph "Russian-American Relations and the Sale of Alaska. 1834-1867", and in the three-volume "History of Russian America" in 1999, also cites in both editions a note from Count Muravyov-Amursky, allegedly addressed by him back in 1853 to Nicholas the First, where Muravyov allegedly claimed that the dominion of the North American States throughout North America "naturally" and that "we must bear in mind that sooner or later

they will have to cede our North American possessions "...

And here, too, a number of questions arise.

Firstly, if everything written above is true, then why does Bolkhovitinov himself claim that for the first time the idea of the possibility of sale was officially put forward by Konstantin? And what, a note from the governor general to the emperor - an unofficial document?

Further, Bolkhovitinov also reported that Muravyov's note was considered in a committee with the participation Admiral General Konstantin

But why then did Konstantin not include Muravyov among the possible experts? He was authoritative, was (according to Bolkhovitinov) a supporter of the sale, and he personally was to the Grand Duke close.

After all, the official biographers of Constantine emphasized (albeit misleading us) that "every matter of any importance was studied by him personally" ...

But here's the thing - was it a boy?

After all, Bolkhovitinov cites this whole story with the official (!) note of Muravyov and its consideration, referring for some reason not to the "archive-fund-file-storage sheet", as usual, but to an old one - 1889, a book by a certain B.V. Struve "Memories of Siberia, 1848-1854".

But what about the "retention list"? Why all of a sudden neither the note nor the protocols of the committee are in the archives? And if they are, why is Nikolai Bolkhovitinov nodding at Bernhard Struve? This ordinary state councilor, appointed in 1858 as vice-governor in Astrakhan (Konstantin calls him Struve of Astrakhan), had a relationship with the Grand Duke. And Bernhard Vasilievich was, among other things, the father of Pyotr Bergardovich Struve, a not very clear figure - an economist, a cadet, an ideologist of the White movement, an organizer of the evacuation of Wrangel's army from the Crimea and an emigrant professor all rolled into one.

But the apple tree is not far from the fallen apple ...

So the story with Muravyov's "note" for me personally looks more like an old falsification, designed to somehow ennoble the unsightly story of the sale and the role of the Grand Duke in it, and at the same time cast a shadow on Muravyov, who was not distinguished by softness towards mediocrities like Struve ...

BACK, however, to our august rams... On March 23, 1859, Konstantin wrote to his brother from Naples: *"My dearest Sasha! I sincerely thank you for this sweet and interesting letter. Just like You, I hope that our alliance with France will lead to the benefit and glory of our dear Mother Russia ... If England does not confuse everything with her usual duality, I am convinced that then everything will work out well and that we will remain in peace.*

A few years later, the same addressee will send squadrons of Popov and Lesovsky to the Atlantic the shores of America for anti-French and anti-English demonstrations.

And both monarchist brothers will "get closer" to the "Republicans"-Yankees - in an incomprehensible by whom their confidence that

The United States, spreading across the continent, "sooner or later will meet us there ...". Although in reality this never happened - Alaska to this day has remained cut off from the main territory of the United States, and from the nearest former Russian and now US place on the Pacific coast of North America to the same main territory - almost a thousand kilometers!

However, Konstantin believed in the omnipotence of the United States, while at the same time ranting about patriotism, and at the end of 1857 - on December 7 (19), he resumed his presentation to Gorchakov. He, either from his own "big" mind, or from someone else's suggestion, declared that one should not combine "merchant and administrator" in one person and that "such a combination is extremely harmful to the peoples subject to the company."

Allegedly, the well-educated "reformer" somehow lost sight of the fact that all the successes of the colonial policy of the Western powers rested on "such a combination", that the West India and East India companies were just examples of such a combination, and that something similar represented RAC's rival is the Hudson Bay Company, the Hudson's Bay Company...

And the Russians Grigory Shelikhov, Alexander Baranov, Ivan Kuskov, Mikhail Buldakov were not only talented merchants, but also talented administrators.

But to combine the post of top administrator with the manners of a Russian master (as in the case of the brothers Romanovs) was really extremely harmful for the peoples subject to this "company" ...

But Konstantin also dabbled in geopolitics, stating in a note dated December 7: *"In accordance with the special nature and historical development, it is advisable for Russia to strengthen itself in its center, and the United States, following the natural order of things (? - S.K.) should strive to possess throughout North America."*

This "general-admiral" of the Russian fleet, this "educated" "reformer" slavishly repeated the flat, miserable, blackening thoughts of the Russian people, prompted by someone, completely ignoring the ideas the great Lomonosov, and even that geopolitical reality, which in six months will dictate the articles of the Russian-Chinese Aigun Treaty on securing Russia's lands along the Amur.

By the way, Academician Bolkhovitinov remarks about these "ideas" of the Grand Duke: "On the whole ... he cannot be denied the ability to think strategically..."

Eh!

GORCHAKOV, of course, showed the emperor already the first letter from Konstantin - dated March 22 (3 April), and he then made a note on the first page: *"This thought is worth considering."*

In fact, the fact that Konstantin double appealed to Alexander on a delicate issue through an intermediary, and not directly, looks strange and is uncharacteristic for the relationship of the brothers. So here I also see someone's cunning game, but God bless her ...

One way or another, after the first litter of the tsar, Gorchakov decided to consult with Wrangel. When the sale had already taken place, Ferdinand Petrovich Wrangel was in his seventy-first year (he died three years later). He managed to be at the head of the Naval Ministry, become a full admiral and an honorary academician, a member of the State Council, and retire in 1864.

And when one of the offspring of his stormy life, one of the hopes of Russia, began to threaten in the second

half of the 60s, a real inglorious death, Wrangel in the end - "as a patriot of his homeland, he passionately protested against ... sales" (this is how the "Stalinist" TSB wrote about him).

But, alas, he did not immediately behave decisively, and the answer to Gorchakov was very diplomatic.

In a note dated April 9 (21), 1857, he wrote:

Further in this first note, Wrangel called the possible amount for the request - 7,442,800 silver rubles. However, the very next day he sent Gorchakov another, brief note, where he specified: *"If it were not for future fears, then without any doubt, 20 million. R. silver could not be considered a full compensation for the loss of possessions promising in the development of industrial activity important results"*

So, Wrangel: 1) drew attention to the fact that the scope of the problem includes not only continental possessions, but also islands; 2) recalled that Russian America is an enduring and practical incentive for Russia's long-range maritime activity; 3) alas, he did not protest sharply and "hotly" against the sale and only considered it necessary not to sell too cheap.

However, as can be seen from what he himself wrote, he did not consider the proposed undertaking either necessary or useful for Russia, leaving the government to assess both the necessity and usefulness of it, and at the same time take responsibility for the essence of this assessment.

And the fact that the second note was written immediately after the first one speaks of obvious excitement and confusion. Ferdinand Petrovich ... Still - such news should have deafened him like a butt on the head!

But he did not decisively defend Russian America - being not only a patriot, but also realist. Although, I think, I started a covert struggle with this idea right away ...

Gorchakov quickly prepared his note.

This note of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs "On the cession of our possessions in North America to the United States" marked "Very secret", dated April 29 (May 11), 1857 and prepared for the "Highest Report", began with the words: "The Ministry of Foreign Affairs fully shares the idea of his *imperial Highness Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolayevich regarding the cession of our possessions ...* "

So, Gorchakov agreed with the idea of a sale (he was principled only in unprincipled matters), but admitted that it was necessary in the strictest confidence to instruct the Russian envoy in Washington, Eduard Stekl, "to find out the opinion of the *Washington Cabinet on this subject*" and that *"the transfer should be completed in 4 s more than a year, when the rights and privileges, as well as the conditions concluded with the North American Company, will end. This delay is already necessary in order to give the company time to bring its operations and affairs to an end ... "*

What is amusing - not yet knowing whether the Yankees needed Russian America, the St. Petersburg dignitaries were already talking about her concession as if it had been decided. Apparently, some in the Russian capital were not so ignorant of the mood of the Yankees.

And here we must immediately say about the dark role of Eduard Stekl. This key, in fact, figure of the upcoming transaction will appear every now and then in my narrative, but this will not make it clearer, but will become even more mysterious.

However, there is a time for everything...

THE DECISION to postpone the decision until the end of the "conditions" either with the Hudson's Bay Company, or with

The American-Russian trading company in San Francisco looked incomprehensible - after all, these "conditions" were expiring. And here, too, one can assume some kind of deaf opposition - the kings were not up to the details, and time dragged on.

But here Stekl openly enters the game (I would say, it's true, "they are entering with Stekl") ... He sends Gorchakov from Washington, almost one by one (November 13 and December 2, new style), two dispatches, where he begins to frighten Petersburg with the growing claims of the Yankees.

"Monopolies are institutions not of our age," he argues, "and in the Pacific they are just as impossible, just like anywhere else."

If we recall that in the Monroe Doctrine, the Yankees actually declared their monopoly right to the whole continent and were confidently moving towards a monopoly position in the chain of "banana republics", then this passage of Stekl looks like almost self-disclosure.

Even more surprising was his second dispatch, where he frightened Gorchakov and the tsar with the threat of mass migration to Russian America ... Mormons.

This purely American sect of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was founded in 1830 by Joseph Smith. In February 1846, the Mormons, led by the second president of the sect, Young (he declared polygamy part of the doctrine and had 56 children from 28 wives), began to migrate to the West.

Rigid and brutal discipline (recall the second part of Sherlock Holmes' famous debut A Study in Scarlet called "Saintland"), enterprise and hard work ensured the success of the Mormons, and their settlement of Salt Lake City in Utah prospered. However, conflicts with the federal authorities were so strong and constant that later, in 1890, there was a debate in Congress about depriving the Mormons of American citizenship. Formally, polygamy was also punished by law (5 years in prison for each extra wife), but the Mormons were strong and almost uncontrollable from the outside (their internal self-government was almost despotic).

That is, the Mormons turned out to be the "enfant terrible" ("terrible child") of American democracy. And now Stekl scared the tsar with them and reported that he even consulted with US President Buchanan, and he, allegedly smiling, replied:

- How to resolve this issue is your concern; as for us, we would be very happy with getting rid of them.

The hint was transparent - here, they say, what threatens you, and so that our headache does not fall on you, pain, we are ready to rid you of it, freeing you from the lands claimed by the Mormons.

At the same time, the sound idea that the US federal authorities, if they acquire Russian possessions with the Mormons who moved there, will again receive an old headache, does not occur to anyone.

Moreover, for all the absurdity of the rumors spread by someone, for all the outward idiocy of the threat (the Mormons had nothing more to do - they were not bad in Utah), it worked ... *about the need to resolve the issue of our American possessions.*

And then the second letter of Konstantin arrived in time, and on February 7 (19), 1860, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs received almost an anonymous but lengthy note about the same thing - about the need to sell ...

HISTORIANS are all arguing whether the "subtle and hard to read" signature is deciphered as "Popov" (rear admiral), or as "Shestakov" (by the number of letters it fits more) ...

I can reassure them - it was written, of course, by an ardent supporter of the sale, Captain 1st Rank (later - Admiral) Ivan Shestakov - a friend of Konstantin and his adjutant, a personality of a mobile mind, but adventurous and limited, but in relation to moral qualities - doubtful.

He was a writing man, wrote the memoirs "Half a century of ordinary life", participated in the writing of the "Black Sea Pilots", and in the times described embossed several articles in the "Sea Collection" under the pseudonym "Excelsior" (which also translates as the motto "Higher and Higher", and as the epithet "supreme").

The foreign pseudonym was not taken from the ceiling - the articles were about America, where Shestakova was sent in 1856 to oversee the construction of the frigate General-Admiral.

And this "Excelsior", without setting foot on the land of Russian America, but having joined the US "freedom", stated without hesitation that " *the company (RAC. - S.K.), without bringing absolutely any benefit to domestic industry, is still operating in harm to the native population*" ...

A professional naval officer, he did not even briefly appreciate the ever-increasing military-strategic importance of Russian America, but his next words betrayed both his influence on the views of Konstantin and the consistency of Shestakov's actions and Stekl's actions (presumably not due to them). In unison with Glass, Shestakov argued: "The time for such commercial companies with special government power has long passed."

And with what pathos, more suitable for some Adams or Seward, the Russian (alas, Russian) sailor wrote about the geopolitical claims of the Yankees, makes us recall the pathos of Fyodor Palen's note and suspect that our Ivan went through a similar treatment. Only not in Paris, but in Washington.

Well, in fact, can a normal Russian person express himself and think in the following way?
way:

It's necessary! The masses of the population in the United States (it was then hardly possible to speak of "the people") were very resistant to "high aspirations." This was the deed and lot of the elite, who covered high dirty selfish plans.

And for Shestakov, the States looked either like a new Athens, or a new Sparta ... For Russia, this Ivan, who does not remember his relationship, also saw a predetermined path - to go like a ram to the slaughter. And no worries about it!

Academician Bolkhovitinov, by the way, certifies him as an enlightened and educated sailor ...

N-yes...

An interesting assessment of Shestakov in the memoirs "In the service of the three emperors" of the general from infantry Yepanchin (his father was the head of the Naval Academy and the Naval Cadet Corps) ...

Yepanchin writes: "The head of the Naval Ministry was Adjutant General Admiral Nikolai Karlovich Krabbe, a rather careless person and little knowledge of maritime affairs (the characterization is absolutely true, Krabbe hung out all his life in staff and adjutant positions and almost did not know the sea. - S.K.) . Shestakov (we are talking about the times of the 70s, when he was in the Marine Committee. - S.K.) was an intelligent person, but intriguing.

And this intriguer in the business of selling Russian national interests turned out to be quite in his place ... And the words: "What cannot be kept, it is better to yield in advance and voluntarily" - will become an excuse for all those who saw no other way out than sale, and a battle slogan all those who actively sought sales.

These latter had to hurry in order to be in time before the twenty-year term of RAC privileges expires and they will have to be extended, at the same time updating the RAC Charter.

And it seems that everything, in principle, was already decided then, at the end of the fifties - both among the Yankees and the Vaneks they had incited. But an unforeseen circumstance interfered - the Civil War of the North and the South, which began in 1861 and ended in the year 1865.

United (then rather - Disconnected) States seethed this time quite massively and strongly.

And it was not a desire to abolish slavery. Here I will simply refer to such an expert on the liberation movement as Jawaharlal Nehru: "Slavery was not the main cause of the Civil War ... Lincoln assured until the very last moment that he would keep slavery where it exists. In fact, complications arose due to the difference and even some clashes of the economic interests of the North and the South ...".

And dollars are not some kind of *manifest destiny for you!* Dollars are serious! And so the interest in the reforms this time was, although not nationwide, but rather broad. And internal contradictions programmed a civil war.

It was risky to start public attempts to deal with Russian America in such an environment ... The Yankees were not up to it ...

Meanwhile, the Russian-American Company by 1862 once again exhausted its mandate for a monopoly position in Russian America.

Monopoly is a tricky thing. It can slow things down - if the monopolist is mercenary and short-sighted. It can also provide a quick leap forward - if the monopolist is smart and active.

February 18 (March 2), 1861 Konstantin sent a note to the Minister of Finance Knyazhevich on 14 sheets. It is difficult (yes, almost impossible!) to believe that he himself wrote this note. And it's even

not that for a "talented reformer" it was hardly feasible work. Someone's authorship (most likely the same Shestakov) betrays the style - the same arguments about the "natives", about the "RAC monopoly", about its "harm", etc.

One could agree here with one thing - in the form in which the RAC existed, it is outdated.

In fact, all this time, she really combined the functions of state administration of the state's possessions, which were unusual for a commercial enterprise, with a purely fishing trade. activity.

And now it was possible to deprive her of special privileges, giving her the opportunity to try herself in the Russian America and other Russian subjects, but...

But with the obligatory assumption by the state of the administrative functions of the RAC. It was time to form, say, the Alaska Territory with a governor-general, station garrisons there, base a separate naval squadron on Novo-Arkhangelsk.

It was possible and necessary to change the status of RAC, but why sell Russian America? Why hard link her fate with the fate of CANCER?

And if the state was still not ready for decisive administrative steps, then it was necessary to preserve the existing situation for some time, backing up the RAC with political rigidity in relation to US claims.

The RAC did not seek to develop the region for real, and especially the interior. But it was also

it is understandable: here it was not so much certain profits that awaited her, but probable losses - at least the first time.

So here, too, it was necessary to get down to business in a state-like manner, that is, with the involvement of opportunities and funds directly from the state.

After all, the strategic importance of Russian America was obvious!

And here Ferdinand Petrovich Wrangel entered into open battle! On March 1 (13), 1861, he sends his objections to the same Knyazhevich - "for a fair assessment of the grave and undeserved accusations (against the RAC. - S.K.) contained in the note led. book. Constantine"...

And the Main Board of the RAC prepared in the spring of 1861 "A Brief Historical Review of the Formation and Actions of the Russian-American Company from the very beginning of its establishment to present tense."

Would like to publish it now!

By the beginning of the 1960s, RAC did not, of course, have a bright personality. Its director was quite an ordinary general Poltkovsky, the ruler of the colonies was quite an ordinary captain of the 1st rank Ivan Vasilyevich Furugelm (his name and patronymic was found only in a specialized small-circulation monograph).

The RAC did not have the spirit that Baranov's "Pizarro Russian" was driven by.

But, despite the catastrophic consequences of the state refusal at the time of the ideas and norms of the Decree of September 4, 1821, the Company lived on. From 1822 to 1860, the treasury received 6,508,891 rubles 46 kopecks of various fees from the Company. And the shareholders received 4,500,556 rubles 85 kopecks of dividends. The capital of the Company was estimated at 3,721,400 rubles with an annual income of 148,856 silver rubles.

The main share here was, however, already the income from the tea trade - 1,649,724 silver rubles for the years 1850-1859. The fur trade grew weak and became almost unprofitable. But the undermined fishery could be restored - if the waters of Rueska America were strictly closed for free foreign industry.

In 1859, the batteries and fortifications of Novo-Arkhangelsk were strengthened, overhauled the neighboring Ozersky redoubt, the magnetic observatory was repaired.

The company had rich coal reserves, timber, harvested ice and fish, and, of course, conducted traditional (but, alas, not traditionally profitable) fisheries for her.

There were also "excellent" (Wrangel's assessment) seaports in Russian America.

The Company's fleet in 1860 consisted of 13 ships, and 10 of them were built in North America, but not all of them in the United States! "Kamchatka" (built in 1853) and "Tsesarevich" RAC received from Hamburg, the brig "Shelikhov" - from Lübeck.

In the USA, the Company ordered seven ships: the ships Nikolai I (1853), the Tsaritsa (1854), the barges Prince Menshikov (1845) and Nakhimov, the brig Grand Duke Konstantin (1840) and the steamships Alexander II "(1856) and "Grand Duke Konstantin "(1856) ... But the other three were also American, but - Russian construction! The schooner "Tungus" (1848) and the steamers "Nikolai I" and "Baranov" were launched by the Novo Arkhangelsk shipyard ... In 1859, the hull of a new steamer was laid there. A fact that needs no special comment...

BUT IS IT ALL SOLID AND STABLE?

And so, to check the state of affairs in May 1860, two auditors were sent to Russian America with

wide powers. Actual State Councilor S.A. was appointed from the Ministry of Finance. Kostlivtsev, and from the Naval Ministry - Lieutenant Commander P.N. Golovin.

In the autumn of 1861 they returned.

And if in tsarist Russia they listened to an honest voice, and not to *whoever and what*, then the question could be considered clarified in principle.

Kostlivtsev and Golovin were sent to close Russian America. And you should have soul responsible and patriotic, to present something quite different instead.

And this is exactly what the auditors did ...

There was no mention of the wisdom of giving up our possessions in their reports at all. At the same time, Kostlivtsev, as a financier, looked at the economic side of the matter and noted that if the RAC is deprived of special rights, then it is necessary to lay down duties from it, and "the government will have to accept the *management and maintenance of the Russian American colonies at its own costs and responsibility ...*".

The auditors did not find any special "violence" in the colonies, but we are more interested in Golovin's report ... Having met with Stekl, he and Kostlivtsev heard a lot of different things from him, but in the end the envoy admitted that "he has the most superficial ideas about the current state of the colonies (like that! - S.K.) and would like to receive all the necessary information about the productivity of the country, its means, wealth, etc., so that later, on the basis of all these data, it would be possible to determine the amount for which the colony could be ceded without loss "...

The glass, of course, was making a roll here, because Wrangel was familiar with the estimates of the "sum". Another thing is that his Washington buddies needed accurate current information.

Well, they got it!

And Golovin - as a sailor and therefore a natural geopolitician, in his report of October 20, 1861 years he argued:

This report lay on the table to Admiral General Konstantin Romanov, and although extracts from it were published in the Marine Collection, this part was excluded from the publication.

And the report of Lieutenant Commander Golovin became, in fact, the only official document substantiating the need not to sell, but to strengthen Russian America.

Russia was lucky for sensible lieutenant commanders! The only pity is that these lieutenant commanders are not lucky with admiral generals ...

I have already given PART of the last extensive quotation in Chapter 2, which began with a description of the arrival of Russian squadrons in non-Russian America for military demonstrations friendly to the Federal Americans.

Let me remind you that soon after the arrival of Admiral Lesovsky's squadron in New York on September 24, 1864, a detachment of Pacific Ocean ships under the flag of Admiral Popov, which came from Vladivostok, anchored in the harbor of the Pacific San Francisco.

When Golovin and his colleague went to the Russian colonies, Vladivostok was not yet not only on the maps, but in general in nature. Only on June 20, 1860, the Manchurian military transport purchased from the United States under the command of Lieutenant Commander A.K. entered the well-hidden Golden Horn Bay in Peter the Great Bay. Shefner. And from it, 40 soldiers of the third company of the 4th East Siberian battalion landed on the western shore of the bay, led by ensign N.V. Komarov. They carried out the order of Muravyov-Amursky to establish the military post of Vladivostok.

Two barracks, a kitchen, a house for officers, a bathhouse and a workshop with a smithy were ready for winter. On the corvette "Griden" came to wintering under the command of Lieutenant Commander G.Kh. Yegersheld.

And in 1864, Popov had already brought to San Francisco from Vladivostok (renamed the port) a detachment of corvettes "Bogatyr", "Kalevala", "Rynda" and clippers "Abrek" and "Gaydamak" ...

As you can see, we had in the Pacific Ocean, albeit not so great, but quite real forces.

Captain Golovin noted in his report that the systematic navigation of Russian warships off the coast of Russian American possessions would have made the most favorable impression: *"The self-will of whalers and smugglers will be put to a limit, the wild tribes inhabiting the colonies will make sure that we are strong not in words, but in fact, and the influence of the Russians in the Pacific Ocean will be actual, while now it's not there at all."*

And now, it would seem, such forces have appeared. And it was possible to conduct that constant cruising, which proposed the establishment of a Special Committee on the organization of the Russian American colonies, formed to consider the reports of Kostlivtsev and Golovin.

Yes, there were already forces!

And they could hold back not only poachers.

GOLOVIN mentioned "transformations". Indeed, they are ripe. This was also recognized by the Special Committee chaired by the Director of the Department of Manufactories and Internal Trade Alexander Ivanovich Butovsky (his own brother served in the same department, and since 1860 he became the director of the Stroganov Central School of Technical Drawing, so their family was not alien to the Russian spirit).

Among the committee members were Yakov Danilovich Ginkulov, a professor at St. Petersburg University, a Romanian by birth and the first Russian Romanian scholar from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Pavel Nikolaevich Glebov, Privy Councilor, leader of the military judicial reform, Auditor General of the Navy - from the Naval Department (later Shestakov replaced him) and a number of other prominent, but not very competent officials, in particular: G.P. Nebolsin from the Ministry of Finance, A.G. Shcherbinin from the Foreign Ministry.

Such a composition gave reason to assume a purely formal approach - by paragraphs, and the figure Glebova spoke about the desire of the higher authorities to focus on the "native" problem.

The report of the committee did treat the "condition of the Aleuts" in detail, but the general conclusion was unexpected - the committee spoke in favor of maintaining the RAC under certain reforms: extending the privileges of the Company not for 20, but for 12 years; the establishment of government supervision and the appointment of a military governor to manage the region; establishment of permanent cruising; a number of administrative innovations in, as they say now, the social sphere.

The main board of the Company protested, and some of the protests were both fair and - at the same time - not very ... Let's say the Company objected to the idea of settlement and development of the interior of Alaska. Such a step was actually more than necessary. It was high time to start Alaska with a geological hammer (especially since there were already data on gold). But it was not a matter of RAK, but - powers.

What was important, however, was the fact that the whole idea of selling somehow faded. And in the spring of 1865, the Ministry of Finance submitted to the State Council a proposal for a new Statute of the RAC and an extension of its privileges until January 1882.

The General Assembly of the State Council recognized the continued existence of the RAC "in many respects good reasons highly desirable."

On June 14 (26), 1865, the opinion of the State Council was signed by its new chairman
- Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolayevich, and approved by Alexander II.

On August 8 (20), this opinion was published in Moskovskie Vedomosti (for some reason, in them, and not in the capital's officialdom).

Perhaps the Polish events influenced the pliability of the tsar and his brother ... In the first half of the 60s, the Civil War in the United States was in full swing. But something happened in Russia that objectively does not contribute to unpopular foreign policy adventures. In January 1863, the Polish insurrection.

Rebelled (as, indeed, before) more pans and more foolish peasants - those who are smarter understood that the tsarist government, although not very good, was better than the panorama. The uprising was quickly suppressed, but the embarrassment was great, and internal affairs somehow overshadowed external ones.

It seemed that all acts of sabotage against Russian America had been repulsed, and one could calmly think over all the obvious and unobvious accumulated problems.

Objectively, the most important of them was, of course, the problem of ensuring stable geopolitical prospects for Russian America, which is impossible without a serious but quite real buildup of the military potential of our possessions, both sea and land.

Here for the sake of it it was possible to go and on loans!

In 1866, an ethnographic exhibition was held in the Moscow Manege. Its main exhibits were almost three hundred mannequins representing all the nationalities of Russia. On this occasion, one of the Moscow newspapers wrote this: "Entering the Manege, the visitor is transferred to a virtual empire, a symbolic space defined by the diversity of its inhabitants. From the Aleuts of Alaska to the Masurians of central Poland, the peoples of the Empire were presented as small fragments of a vast mosaic depicting the vast expanses and diversity of the inhabitants of Russia.

Alas, less than a year remained then until the moment when the Aleuts of Alaska fell out of this "mosaic".

The US Civil War is over. The integrity of the Federation was preserved. The slave-owning agricultural South yielded, the victory remained with the industrial North. And this, among other things, ensured what was *predetermined* for the United States by its long-term supranational patrons - rapid industrial development, without which the United States could not become a world leader.

Now it was possible to return to the question of a sharp change in the prospective Pacific situation in favor of the Yankees and, accordingly, depriving Russia of serious prospects in this part of the planet.

After all, the essence of the problem of sale lay precisely in *this* - no matter what, at that time and later, biased newspapers and historians would say otherwise! Actually, smart Russian people understood this in real time - let's remember at least Golovin's report!

The Yankees got the opportunity to get acquainted with Alaska in detail not only according to the reports of two Russian auditors, but also directly. The fact is that even during the Crimean War, the idea arose of laying a transcontinental Russian-American telegraph from the United States to Europe through British Canada, Russian Alaska, the Bering Strait and Siberia.

The problem of transcontinental communication then turned out to be at a dead end - the first submarine cables laid along the bottom of the Atlantic Ocean were unreliable, failed, torn, laying them was expensive, and the signal over long distances was distorted beyond recognition. And the American businessman P.M. Collins came up with a reasonable idea of minimizing the underwater area, and this was possible only with

version of the Bering Strait.

The project, which is now little known, was put on a serious basis, and by the time it was curtailed (that's right!) The Americans had invested about three million dollars in it - a huge amount for a commercial project. Back in the autumn of 1866, a connecting line was being built from Nikolaevsk-on-Amur to Verkhneudinsk: clearings were cut, poles were installed, materials and equipment were brought to the Amur ...

And now everything was canceled almost instantly! In the summer of 1866, another American entrepreneur, S. Field, managed to successfully lay an underwater transatlantic cable 5100 kilometers long and ensure undistorted signal transmission. And on February 28, 1867, in St. Petersburg, they received a message from the president of the "Company of United Western Telegraphs" J. Ueda "about the termination of work on the Russian-American telegraph."

Perhaps, this was the most outstanding — after the creation of nuclear weapons and their intercontinental ballistic carriers — a case of how the achievements of science and technology can quickly and dramatically affect the existence of states and peoples.

So, in the course of design and survey work, an American expedition legally explored the Yukon basin. Then, by the way, the identity of the Russian Quickpak and the Canadian Yukon was finally established. The Creole Ivan Lukin, already mentioned by me, climbed up the Quickpak to the Russian-Canadian (oh, there was once such a!) Border, and American geologists, led by Robert Kennicott, compiled a map of the basin of the future "golden" river.

At the same time, the Yankees collected abundant information throughout Alaska: fur and fish wealth, forests, climate.

The dramas and tragedies of the last classic "gold rush" of the 19th century on the "Jacklondon" and "Charlichaplin" Klondike played out on Canadian territory, but the former Russian Alaska also became an object.

But that was later, at the end of the century before last. However, long before any "fever" with dispassionately icy analysis became clear the true price of the strategic importance of Alaska.

And this meaning was not even in the place of Alaska in the problem of securing future power. USA. It was more important to exclude the Russian American factor in Russia's geopolitical prospects.

The possession of Alaska could not have had a special impact on the historical fate of the United States.

The possession of Alaska (or its loss) greatly influenced the historical fate of Russia.

And thus - on the general appearance of the future world ...

That is why, despite what seemed to be a quite definite decision of the State Council, the idea of selling Russian America was not buried, but only temporarily postponed. The latent, behind-the-scenes, secret work to promote it not only did not subside, but gained and gained momentum.

And the Russian envoy to the United States, Eduard Stekl, acted more and more actively here ...

GLASS was, of course, a dark figure. Looking ahead, I will say that even the exact date of death of this holder of the Russian-Polish Order of the White Eagle, Privy Councilor, Baron is in doubt. "Not earlier than 1874," reported the Dictionary of American History in 1997, edited by Academician A.A. Fursenko. And everything. However, according to some other sources, he died in Paris in 1892 on the 88th

year of life.

Academician Bolkhovitinov, who reported the latest information in 1999 with reference to the American

the source of 1990, in 1990, in any case, did not know this, since then he completed his monograph on the "sale of Alaska" as follows: "Further (after this sale. - S.K.) the fate of E.A. The glass remains unknown..."

But it is unlikely that Stekl's biographers can boast of clarifying the entire biography of the baron in general.

His visible biography begins at the age of thirty-five, from 1839, when he begins to serve in the Russian representation in the United States. The envoy at that time was already Alexander Bodisko, the son of the director of the Moscow Assignment Bank. The father received the nobility only in 1803, but the son, born in 1786, was not yet thirteen (!) years old and was recorded as a titular cadet in the Collegium of Foreign Affairs already in 1799. Banknotes - they are banknotes everywhere.

Then for a long time, Bodisko the son revolved in the field of Scandinavian affairs, and on March 16 (Russian style), 1837, he was appointed envoy to Washington, in which capacity he remained until his death, which followed on January 23 (new style), 1854.

This figure is also waiting for its researcher, since Alexander Andreevich (wow - double namesake Baranov!) Bodisko is also not very clear.

So, in 1840, he becomes a Privy Councilor, and at about the same time ... marries an American.

This is not forbidden, of course, even if you are fifty-four years old, but Bodisko also became a follower of the Episcopal Church. It is also not prohibited, but the change of religion by the current diplomatic representative of the Orthodox state in the host country is somewhat strange. And this gets out of his hands.

By the way, his older brother Nikolai got away with a lot. This one served in the navy, fought, in 1808 he became a rear admiral, during the Russian-Swedish war he occupied the island of Gotland with a detachment of two thousand, but soon left it, attacked by a five thousandth Swedish detachment. And here something surprising began: first, for this expedition, Nikolai Bodisko receives "Anna" of the 1st degree, and then he is put on trial and expelled from service on May 26, 1809, deprived of the order "for the removal from the island of Gotland of the ground forces that were under his superiors, and the position of the weapon without resistance" and sent to Vologda.

However, on October 4, 1811, he was "most graciously forgiven" and again accepted into the service (the order was not "restored" to him, that is, the accusation was not recognized as erroneous, although a year before his death in 1815 he was again awarded "Anna" of the 1st degree).

As for Bodisko Alexander, according to the Dictionary of American History, his reports allegedly differed in "accurate characteristics of US foreign policy actions, which contributed to the development of an adequate course on the part of Russia and the rapprochement of the two countries."

I doubt it, because there could be only one adequate Russian reaction to really adequate reports: extreme alertness due to the obvious hostility of the United States. One US pressure on Russia to deprive us of Fort Ross (that is, a full-fledged food base of Russian America) speaks for itself.

Again, it is believed that Bodisko is just the opposite - Ross tried to save it for Russia, but after reading this, I immediately remembered the scene of the audience of the Spanish ambassador with Henry of Navarre, described by Dumas in Forty-Five, when the ambassador of the French king Henry III is the jester Shiko, sat in a closet stuffed into it by the King of Navarre himself.

This, of course, is fiction, but it seems to me that in real life often

something like this happens...

Bodisko, like his predecessor Krüdener, was, of course, an associate of Nesselrode. And - in my opinion, his activities in the United States are well characterized by the fact that on the occasion of the death of Bodisko, the US Congress adjourned its meetings for a day, which was an unprecedented event in the US parliamentary history.

US President Franklin Pierce and members of the government personally attended the funeral ceremony. Moreover, the Russian ambassador was buried in the American Georgetown, and this is about two hundred kilometers from Washington, and even through the Chesapeake Bay you have to cross.

Of course, Bodisko was a doyen of the diplomatic corps (seventeen years in one country is not joke), but not every doyen is seen off on his last journey by the entire official elite of the United States.

And in the rarest cases, the ambassador of a great country is buried far from this country (however, this case with the son of a Moscow banker, perhaps the only one in the modern history of the world!).

It was with this Bodisko Stekl that he labored as an associate, and after his death he accepted his post for a long time.

In order to finish with these Bodiscos, I will inform you that after 1854 this surname did not disappear from the lists of our embassy, since the son of Bodisko, Vladimir Alexandrovich, was listed as the secretary of the Russian mission. The son turned out to be worthy of his father, actively participated together with Stekl in the preparation of an agreement on the sale of Russian America, and then twice went to St. Petersburg and back for its speedy ratification. After Stekl's departure to Russia, he acted as Chargé d'Affaires ad interim and at the end of the 70s was still in the States (I am not aware of his further fate).

Glass, on the other hand, was small dexterous - however, only for the "wise men" from the Russian Foreign Ministry. So, at the beginning of the Civil War, he repulsed a dispatch there, in which he called on the Russian government to remain an impartial witness to "these internal disputes between the two branches of the Anglo-Saxon race (meaning the Yankees and the British. -S.K.), from which humanity will only benefit," since -de such a strife is "the best guarantee against the ambitious designs and political selfishness of this race."

It would seem - exactly, brilliantly, patriotically? Alas, all this undoubted truth was just a bait, pecking at which the Russian supreme power had to "swallow" already other recommendations "patriot"...

Firstly, Stekl said, the United States is an important element of the global balance of power ... But here the future baron passed off wishful thinking.

Yes, let me say that at that time it was absolutely not so, because the United States at that time (and much later) did not possess armed forces, more or less capable (both psychologically and militarily-technically) of waging serious military operations outside the national territory and far from the homeland.

Secondly, Stekl declared that for Russia there is no North and South, but only an American federation, the existence of which is "more important for us than for any foreign state", and that "preserving the unity of the Union corresponds to our political interests."

The logical "curbet" here was simply acrobatic! The baron was doing some political backflip mortale, during which at some point the head and legs change places, but only for a while.

At first, he declared that it would be better for Russia to remain an impartial observer, and immediately offered to actually intervene in the situation on the grounds that American internal affairs are more important for Russia (!) than for anyone else!

N-yes...

Preserving the unity of the United States was in the interests of their supranational patrons, and for this reason alone the defeat of the arrogant South, really saturated with the ideas of "isolationism" at the elite level, was predetermined.

But with any theoretically possible development of events, only the option was beneficial for Russia the maximum weakening of the United States, and even better - their fragmentation.

The United States could not be our political and military ally, not only because it could only be an "ally" that was self-serving, that is, perfidious, but above all because their purely military potential was not great.

And from an economic, from a trade point of view, what difference does it make with whom to trade - with southerners, with northerners? They themselves traded with each other during the Civil War! Dollars don't smell!

The weak United States ruled out a real threat to Russian America and Russia's interests in the Pacific in general. ocean.

However, Stekl for some reason claimed the opposite, and - surprisingly, they listened to him! Why Glass's opinion is a man

ka without a past, rootless, without any prior merits outside of his "field" in the United States, was taken seriously in the Russian capital - this in itself is a mystery, even to think about historians never got around to it.

But this is an interesting question.

But historians - the same academician Bolkhovitinov - believe that it was Stekl who again raised the issue of a possible sale after his next visit to St. Petersburg in October 1866. Glass remained there until the beginning of 1867, and the length of his stay - and even in the damp, uncomfortable autumn season - speaks volumes in itself. And this detail (like many others) allows me to see in Glass not only and not so much a Russian diplomat, but a certain emissary of such powerful supranational forces that the Russian elite was no longer able to ignore them.

True, one cannot rule out a simple selfish, purely "ruble" interest as this elite, and Grand Duke Constantine personally (which will be discussed later).

But in the end, Stekl could only handle the sale as a trusted consultant and courier. And the fundamental points were discussed, presumably, not with Stekl, but earlier - in the summer of 1866

of the year...

AS we know, the positive opinion of the State Council on Russian America was approved by Alexander on June 14 (26), 1866. And on April 4 (16) of this year, Dmitry Karakozov shot at the tsar at the gates of the Summer Garden, and Alexander was saved by the fact that the peasant Komissarov, who was nearby, managed to push the terrorist's hand, and the bullet passed by (Komissarov was elevated to noble dignity on the same day).

Corresponding to the occasion, congratulations came from all the ruling and reigning persons "civilized" world, but the Yankees here came out not only from the protocol framework, but also brought the situation into the category of a pompous booth, where the luck of the king became only an excuse

for an unparalleled before and after demonstration of their "love" for Russia.

At first, the Russian monarch was welcomed by the congress - with a special grandiloquent resolution adopted unanimously by both chambers at the suggestion of the leaders of the radical Republicans (n-yes) Stevens and

Sumner and approved by President Andrew Johnson on May 16.

The case in the political history of the United States is again unprecedented!

And after that, it was decided to send an emergency embassy to Russia on the occasion of the success of the tsar and the failure of the "enemy of emancipation" (n-yes) Karakozov. Deputy Minister of the Navy Captain Gustav Vasa Fox was appointed its head.

At that time, Field's transatlantic cable had already been laid, and a congratulatory resolution could have been to "beat off" it too (it was a novelty, and everything could also be furnished with pomp).

But now - Fox went to Russia on the huge monitor Miantonomo, accompanied by the frigate Augusta, and arrived in Kronstadt on July 25 (Russian style), 1866. Along the way, there were delays in England, Denmark, Sweden, that is, they were not in a particular hurry, although it was possible to make all the incidental visits on the way back.

When Minister of Marine Crabbe received a dispatch from Stekl announcing Fox's mission, Alexander "Highly commanded" Crabbe: "Accept with Russian cordiality" ...

Well, we have always been able to do this - to the point of self-forgetfulness, to the loss of even an external sense of decency (I am not talking about the loss of self-esteem, because in order to lose it, you must first have it).

Academician Bolkhovitinov claims that Fox's reception "resulted in an unprecedented demonstration friendly feelings ... ", etc., and especially, they say, the Russian sailors distinguished themselves here.

Well, staff figures like Crabbe - maybe they distinguished themselves ... But readers of the lieutenant's article Zbyshevsky about the atrocities of the Yankees in Russian Siberia (not talking about Russian America); and those

more - witnesses of these outrages, caps (oh, sorry, caps) were hardly thrown into the air ... But noise And there was a lot of champagne...

Fox left on September 3, having visited Moscow and triumphantly rode along the Volga from Nizhny Novgorod to Tver.

At a celebration in Nizhny Novgorod, where, as the newspapers reported, "representatives of the peoples from all over the Russian Empire gathered (I wonder if there were Aleuts there? - S.K.)", Fox called on the audience nothing more and nothing less than "to a moral union not for a threat to someone, but for happiness and prosperity the human race."

Obviously, within the framework of this projected "moral alliance", the American envoy to Russia, Clay, handed over to Crabbe a list of issues of interest to Fox: plans for admiralities, docks, naval arsenals with the designation of "reserve magazines", a description of artillery pieces, a training system for sailors, the number of officers and sailors, the full ship composition of the fleet, detailed information about battleships and other "little things" ...

I cannot help but inform the reader that Academician Bolkhovitinov, who has been mentioned by me more than once, in the most rosy tones, reports about the address, which at the same time when Fox was talking about a "moral union", was presented to the Tsar, who was relaxing in Livadia, by a group of American tourists who made a round-the-world trip on steam yacht Quaker City. Among them was the special correspondent of the newspaper "Daily Alpha California" Samuel L. Clemens, who soon published his "Simples Abroad" under the pseudonym "Mark Twain" ...

Bolkhovitinov writes about Twain's address and reaction without a shadow of irony, cites page 383 of volume 1 of Twain's twelve-volume collected works, where there is "Simples", and claims that "the royal

mercy clearly dulled the skepticism of the future great satirist "...

However, on page 374 of this volume we read: "So, we ... sail to the imperial residence. What a fuss will now rise! ... How many important committees will be created (it was precisely in the committee for compiling the address that Twain ended up. - S.K.)! real emperor noticeably cools down. Where to put your hands? And the legs? ... "

And then all this "test" is described in a tone of sometimes good-natured, and sometimes so ironic (and not very grateful) scoffing and skepticism that I, who did not belong to Alexander's admirers, even felt somehow offended for the emperor, when on page 379, Twain said smugly that the Yankees were already accustomed to the fact that the palaces were shown to them by livery lackeys and demanded a franc for this, and here "the emperor of all Russia and his family themselves led us to their residence," and here he added: "They didn't ask anything for the entrance" ...

Twain wrote there: "Baron Wrangel has also arrived. At one time he was the Russian ambassador in Washington (yes! - S.K.) ... the baron is a very pleasant person and, according to rumors, enjoys the greatest confidence and Emperor's respect...

Alas, Twain's rumors were deceived, because in three and a half months Ferdinand Petrovich would not be invited to that "special meeting" where the sale of Russian American possessions would be finally and unexpectedly decided.

FOX retired, but only to deliver a congressional resolution and congratulations on successful outcome of the assassination attempt on the tsar, did he appear in Russia?

The reason, if you think about it, was insignificant. However, from the anti-monarchist bullet Karakozov was inflated a kind of sprawling republican elephant.

For what?

To demonstrate Russian-American "friendship" in order to put pressure on France and England? Necessary guess not without...

But how much did Fox's mission have as its task to push the tsar to abandon Russian America?

Although there are rare direct statements in the scientific press that during the stay Fox in Russia, the sale was discussed and decided, all the same academician Bolkhovitinov unambiguously

but declares that there was influence on this matter, but it was general, but there were no specific negotiations, because there is, they say, no documents about that.

But what documents can be discussed in such a delicate matter? After all, with all their august conceit, both the tsar and his brother could not but understand that the sale of Russian lands to them would not add authority (later I will separately talk about the public reaction to it).

It is possible and necessary to reconstruct events according to documents. But often the simple principle "Look for whom beneficial", known to the Romans, is able to help us with no less, and even more documents!

Yes, here is Professor Antonin Debidour, a competent contemporary of the events, in his "Diplomatic History of Europe" writes: "In the middle of 1866, the American delegation came with great fanfare to congratulate the tsar on his happy deliverance from the attempted assassination of Karakozov. It was accepted throughout the empire, not only with great honors, but also with a very significant emphasis on cordial feelings. The Yankees and Russians fraternized noisily for several weeks. However, something happened later between the Washington and St. Petersburg offices.

more than a simple exchange of pleasantries. So, for example, the following year, the tsar ceded Russian possessions in America (Alaska) to the United States by a formal agreement.

The king ceded not only Alaska, but also a strip of up to 54 degrees with the adjacent archipelago named after his uncle, and the Aleuts, and much more. But this is the only remark I can make to the quote from Debidur...

IN SEPTEMBER 1866, Fox left Russia, and in October Stekl arrived in Russia, having spent about two weeks on another transatlantic crossing. He leaves back in January 1867 and arrives in New York on February 15, having completed his 11th sea voyage (that is, it was his sixth "shuttle" trip in several years!).

Given all this "shuttle" fuss, one can imagine such a picture ...

For several years, Stekl tried to persuade the tsar through his senior dignitaries and Konstantin (with whom he either met during these years, or to whom, more likely, he passed on the relevant, in modern terms, "informational" - "analytical" materials).

But all such attempts were repulsed with more or less success.

So Fox came to put the question directly and practically. And already directly trusted agent of the American government. Moreover, to put it at the highest and unofficial level at the same time, under the thunder of fireworks and fountains of champagne ...

And Fox's interest in the capabilities of the Russian fleet was also clearly not accidental. By the second half In the 1960s, Russia had already firmly established itself in the Far East. The Aigun Treaty of 1858 on the Russian-Chinese border, the foundation of Vladivostok, the strengthening of the Russian Pacific Fleet - all this made the Yankees hurry.

Minimal smart Russian policy in this region, and - Russian America would be backed up so that its transition to the United States could become problematic. Could this be allowed in America?

Karakozov's shot was a convenient occasion, and Swedish-American Gustav Vasa Fox moved to Russia...

He returned, made reports to Jackson and Seward. Now it was Glass's turn again...

And Stekl developed such a vigorous activity in St. Petersburg that it was already difficult to understand whose interests does he represent in the capital of the Russian Empire - Russians or Americans?

He is negotiating with Konstantin, with the Minister of Finance Reiter, with the Minister of the Navy Krabbe and, of course, is in contact with Gorchakov. Formally, decisions are made by the highest officials of the empire, but in fact, Stekl sets the tone. Although, it seems that in a narrow circle of the elite involved in the case, a desire is ripening to go even further than the Yankees would like.

Moreover, in addition to documented contacts, Stekl clearly had enough conversations and unrecorded meetings. After all, he had someone to talk to in Petersburg ...

November passed behind all this behind-the-scenes fuss, and it was time to draw up the results of behind-the-scenes conversations in the form of "papers" so beloved by historians.

On DECEMBER 2 (14), 1866, Reiter sends a confidential note to Gorchakov "on the subject of the cession of our North American colonies to the United States for a certain remuneration to the Russian-American Company and the government."

Dear reader! Just now, in the summer, everything seems to have been decided in favor of the RAC (although its charter and privileges were not approved by the emperor, and the highest approval of the "opinion" of the State Council

there could not be a legally full-fledged basis for the continuation of the activities of the RAC).

And now, less than six months later, this issue is back on the agenda. And puts it Glass. And instead of telling him: "My dearest, everything has already been decided at the highest state level!" - dignitaries begin new "discussions", but now - in an extremely narrow circle and extremely confidential ...

And the link is Glass.

The historians of Academician Bolkhovitinov's circle (and these are almost all metropolitan "experts" on the problem) don't even want to hear about some secret motives, about the word "collusion", and after all, the situation around the "Russian-American" issue in its final - as it soon turned out - stage allows you to confidently assert: "Yes, it was a carefully prepared anti-Russian conspiracy!"

And the Minister of Finance, Reiter (who, by the way, was firmly connected with railway projects, which in tsarist Russia was identical with a strong connection with international financial dealers), contrary to facts and logic, declares in December 1866 that "after the seventy years of the company's existence, it has not at all achieved the Russification of the *male population, nor the stable establishment of the Russian element, and in no way contributed to the development of our merchant shipping ...*".

Reiter explained the need to abandon Russian America, among other things, by the fact that we, they say, "Now they are already firmly established in the Amur Territory."

What and who was Mikhail Khristoforovich Reiter?

Appointed Minister of Finance after Knyazhevich in 1862, at the age of forty-two, he remained in this post for sixteen years, later providing financial preparation for the Russian-Turkish war of 1877-1878. Biographers who are close to him claim that he persistently warned Emperor Alexander against unleashing it and "firmly decided to retire after the end of the campaign" ...

And he left ... Although if he foresaw the collapse of the economy in advance (there was no special mind here, however, it was required), it would be more honest and logical to leave "before ...", and not "after ...".

Reiter was friendly with such an odious figure in the history of the Russian economy as "Baron" Alexander Stieglitz, and as a token of "gratitude" Stieglitz "at an extremely cheap price" sold Reiter's sister, Baroness Yulia Nolken, an estate in Courland province. There, in 1890, the ex-minister and buried.

Reiter, who graduated from the Tsarskoye Selo Lyceum, was promoted to the beginning of his career by the poet Vasily Andreevich Zhukovsky, who was married to the cousin of the future minister. But who contributed to it continuation is hard to say...

In 1854, he entered the service in the naval department and became an employee of the "reformer" Konstantin - "Konstantin's eagle", therefore it is believed that Mikhail Khristoforovich was grand princely nominee. But - here is such a "trifle" ...

After the lyceum, Reiter initially served for three years in what seemed to be a future "profile" - in the Ministry of Finance. And then he went to the Ministry of Justice for seven years.

From 1855 to 1858, he studied abroad the "financial" system of the largest European countries (read: England and France) and ... And - the United States!

Returning after this long foreign internship to Russia, Reiter found himself for some reason not in the "eagle's nest", but in the Committee of Railways, which was almost the undivided fiefdom of the tsar's financial agent, Baron Rothschild ...

And just with the Rothschilds of London and Paris, Reiter, who had just become Minister of Finance, entered into negotiations on new loans, to which they immediately "responded", offering 15 million pounds sterling to begin with. It was the seventh 5% loan for this amount!

By that time, the Russian Empire, through the efforts of the "geopoliticians" Nicholas I and his sons Alexander and Constantine, was already in public debt, like an imperial maid of honor at a ball, in silks. If by January 1, 1853, before the Crimean War, the state debt already amounted to a considerable amount of 732 million rubles, then by January 1, 1862 it had grown to 2493 million rubles.

Nearly two and a half billion gold rubles *of that time* !

And to these dry figures, I will now give an amusing illustration from the times immediately after the sale Russian America - from 1870. Reiter was then eight years old before his resignation ...

The permanent holder of all Russian railroad loans, Lionel Rothschild, arranged another one for us that year. And on February 19, 1870, Karl Marx, in a letter to the publisher of the Diplomatic Review, Colette, wrote that the baron placed the Russian loan bonds so cleverly that "it was just child's play to inflate their prices by 4% above their face value in the shortest possible time."

It wouldn't have been like that! Russia's huge need for modern communications, their huge shortage, huge, non-European distances and the iron-clad confidence that the Russian tsar will ultimately pay off any loans with the sweat and blood of a Russian peasant ...

So such and such bonds - but not to be sold in the blink of an eye! And such "childish games" were played by foreign "Russian" financial agents.

And the debt of the empire to these "agents" was already more than two billion!

Yes, there is no time for geopolitical prospects of the current and future centuries...

Reiter, by the way, was also the initiator of the sale of state-owned mining plants and gold mines - naturally, "unprofitable" ...

So, the new tour was started by Reiter with his note to Gorchakov dated December 2...

But the rest, too, however, did not linger. After another conversation with Glass, he informs Gorchakova about her opinion and Konstantin - December 7 via Crabbe.

Style, tone, argumentation - everything is similar to Reiter's note, right down to the references to the "future Amur region.

It was like an avalanche - strictly classified, however. But the events, although hidden from unnecessary witnesses, really grew like an avalanche: on December 12 (24), 1866, Gorchakov directs letter to the king.

And he writes there: *"I cannot take responsibility for making a sole conclusion on the political side of the issue and would like to have the opportunity to discuss it in the presence of V.I. in-va. Perhaps you will deign to allow the question to be discussed under your high chairmanship in a narrow committee, in view of the need to maintain indispensable secrecy, which will consist only of leads. book. Konstantin, Mr. Reiter and myself. Mr. Stekl could have been invited in view of his knowledge of local conditions* (already on the eve of the meeting, Gorchakov suggested inviting Vice Admiral Crabbe as well. - S.K.) "...

Alexander "deigned" ... And he deigned immediately - a week had not passed, and on December 16 (28), 1866, a special meeting began in Gorchakov's front office in the Foreign Ministry building on Palace Square at one o'clock in the afternoon.

Composition: Alexander, Konstantin, Gorchakov, Reiter, Crabbe and Stekl.

And they even managed without a secretary. And what is there - the protocols, presumably, were written in advance.

I note that in the story of the preparation of the meeting, Gorchakov looks so unsightly that Pushkin's lyceum friend can, alas, be suspected of direct participation in the conspiracy. And the following detail allows me to say so. Formally, it was Gorchakov who proposed the composition of the participants. And not only could he, but he was obliged to offer also the candidacy of at least Wrangel. At least offer!

But he didn't offer...

Yes. Ferdinand Petrovich was the director of the RAC, but above all he was a loyal statesman and a naval officer to boot. What state secrets are, he knew firsthand - he was stuffed with them "from kilson to klotik." And he knew how to keep his mouth shut.

And he, unlike the rogue Steklya, knew the "local conditions" and the position of the RAC to the smallest detail. And he was in the capital at that time. Just on December 16, at the request of Reiter, he presented to him a summary of data on RAC.

But no one invited the admiral to Palace Square.

And the emperor, whose "greatest trust and respect" Wrangel enjoyed, in the simple-hearted opinion of Mark Twain, also for some reason did not remember the main expert in Russian America, both in terms of his position and competence. Although Alexander had a memory hereditary Romanov, that is, magnificent.

I have already said that the meeting was held without a secretary because the minutes seemed to be written in advance.

Yes, I have reason to say so ...

Let's say, Reiter's note to Gorchakov is dated December 2, but, of course, it was written even earlier. And in this note, the Minister of Finance informs the Minister of Foreign Affairs about the financial insolvency

CANCER.

But only on December 8, Reiter receives from the director of the State Bank data on the estimate of income and expenses of the Company from

the following summary: "The company can exist under prudent dispositions and commercial knowledge. directors."

So where did Reiter get his information from? And why did he ignore the opinion of his own subordinates? And how could he form his opinion before getting their opinion?

No, Russian America was already to blame for the fact that some people really wanted to "eat" it. And on "special meeting" it was finally "put on the table" - the decision to sell it was made unanimously.

And the king approved it.

In his memorial book for 1866, this was written as follows: "in 1 at K. Gorchakov's meeting. on affairs. America, comp. Dec. sell States"...

At two o'clock, the next event was already recorded, and if we consider that it took some time to get from the Foreign Ministry building to the Winter Palace, it turns out that the Romanovs bar "surrendered" Russian America in less than an hour!

At the suggestion of Reiter, it was decided to sell it for an approximate price of \$ 5 million.

A week later, on December 22, Crabbe presented Alexander with a note "The border line between Russia's possessions in Asia and North America"...

The maritime department drew the border in this note in such a way that the head is spinning. Well, to hell with you - they surrendered, sold the continental possessions - Alaska and the more southern narrow coastal strip along with the Alexander Archipelago.

Well, they did not want to defend the Aleuts (although - why not?).

They didn't leave behind the Pribylov Islands standing separately in the Bering Sea with rich seal rookeries - okay!

But the island of St. Lawrence, almost buried in Russian Asia ... Why was it given away ?!
He's closer to Asia than to America!

Then the Commanders would have given it too - they are farther from Kamchatka than Lavrenty is from Chukotka.

And on such a note, the tsar deigned to personally note with the curlicues he loved so much: "Okay reported"...

Like this...

Already after Stekl reached Washington and "reported" to Seward, he wrote in blue pencil in draft notes: *"Russia is selling to the United States its possessions on the continent of North America and the adjacent Aleutian Islands, and the border is drawn through the center*

Bering Strait and includes all the islands to the east, starting with Attu ... "

That is, the same "Lavrenty" did not spend the night in his thoughts, and it is understandable - there was not a penny, but suddenly not even Altyn, but a whole fifty! Is it up to Lawrence here!

I note, by the way, that the large island of the Aleutian ridge, Attu, supposedly "adjacent" to America, and the smaller island, Agattu, are three times closer to mainland Russia than to mainland America. That's what they are called, these islands are Near... And the Russians called them that.

And the Near Islands could and should have been reprimanded for further possession.

And Crabbe handed over all this with his card right away - not only without a fire fight, but even without a fight diplomatic.

The participants in the "special meeting" understood, they understood that they were doing something bad... It was not for nothing that everything was discussed in a really narrow circle, and in this same circle it was decided to present the matter as if the initiative came from the United States...

The proposal for such a "knight's move" was formally made by Stekl, and it was contained in the summary summary of opinions.

This summary was prepared specifically for the meeting in Gorchakov's department (obviously - in the Asian Department), and it included the opinion of Konstantin - as representing both himself and the maritime department; the opinion of Reiter, who represented the Ministry of Finance; and the opinion of Stekl - representing either himself or the US State Department.

So, the part that stated the "opinion of the envoy in Washington" (not the opinion of the Foreign Ministry) ended with the words: *"It is important that the negotiations be arranged in such a way that the initiative comes from the United States and that the imperial government is not bound by anything and retains the right after once the offer is made, accept it or reject it.*

Now it's called "cover". It is quite acceptable to assume that such a "patriotic" and

With a "prudent" passage, Stekl insured himself against possible accusations by the Russian people of playing on the wrong side.

Of course, not only Caesar's wife is beyond suspicion - Russian dignitaries have always and without exception been concerned, of course, exclusively with state interests. Other interpretations were not allowed by the censors, and it was impossible to imagine that the most "resolute" Russian newspaper would suddenly declare: "Ah, he is selling his homeland!" (although Russia was not the birthplace of Glass) ...

But here are the rumors, the rumors... They are not censored, after all. Suddenly emerges from the limits of a narrow circle, which the first "Uh!" this time it was Glass. And who is he - this glass? And submit here his pedigree!

So let the "initiative come" from the supposedly stubborn Yankees.

Stekl's proposal was, of course, supported. The Bare Romanovs and their dignitaries were also worried about their reputation.

And after all, what is funny and sad is that although Russia formally offered the Yankees a part of its national "body" in the style of a covetous prostitute itself, it was the Yankees who pushed the situation to such a "corrupt" outcome for a good forty years!

The Yankees pretended that they didn't care about this deserted Alaska and other things, but in fact they headed for the Russian North American lands back in the Monroe Doctrine! And how it was possible to talk about the friendliness of the United States in the presence of this doctrine, I personally cannot understand.

I can't understand either the then Russian Foreign Ministry (well, okay, everything is clear under Nesselrod, but Gorchakov...), I can't understand historians like Bolkhovitinov either!

The anti-Russian Monroe Doctrine alone is enough to assert the opposite: the United States, cleverly, persistently, when necessary - loudly declaring it when necessary - skillfully portraying "indifference" to the problem, led the matter to a creeping annexation of the Russian possessions they hated ...

Even before the formation of the Monroe Doctrine, its future author Adams said in November 1819 at a cabinet meeting: "Until Europe finds that geographically the United States and North America are an identical concept, until then any attempt on our part to force the world to give up the belief that we are conceited will have no other effect than his belief that we add hypocrisy to vanity."

They spoke among their own, and therefore they spoke about things, although dishonorable, but - the rarest case - honestly, without bluntness.

But in addition to the Monroe Doctrine, the Yankees often blurted out in newspapers, in public statements (the same Seward!).

And it was not Stekl who persuaded the Yankees (as certain American and pro-American historians are trying to prove to us), but the Yankees were so delighted that the "case" had finally been set in motion, that everything was concocted as soon as possible!

Judge, dear reader, yourself! Stekl went ashore in New York on February 15, and even stayed for half a month in the business capital of the United States - allegedly with a sprained leg ligament during the trip, and then - the devil knows! I do not rule out that before the Washington reports he should have reported to Wall Street.

The session of the new congress opened on 5 March. Glass arrived in Washington sometime after March 9th. A The contract was concluded on March 30!

Stekl himself in April 1867 wrote in a personal letter to a friend and patron, manager

Office of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs V.I. Westman: "The whole *thing happened in a hurry, in the American way through.*"

It turns out that there was no need to persuade anyone in Washington - they themselves, for a sweet soul, were aching for the coveted "piece" of millions of square miles.

The Yankees, even for the sake of decency, did not want to waste time! You never know what can happen in Russia! The same Constantine had many influential opponents in Russia. And there might not have been a second Komissarov for the second Karakozov.

And the golden chains of loans - they are, of course, a tenacious and strong thing, but with the determination of the state they are cut by the sword.

Iron is stronger than gold!

Chapter 9

How Alaska was sold to the Romanov bar...

STEKL received the authority to hold talks in Washington, but did not have the right to make a final decision and sign an agreement without the sanction of St. Petersburg. But hardly in a three-week the period between the arrival of the Russian envoy and the conclusion of the treaty there were some serious negotiations and disputes. What was there to argue about when Petersburg, as has already been said, handed everything over immediately - without preconditions.

And if Stekl's dispatches are to be believed, the main problem was to persuade the Yankees to buy from Russia territory larger than the original 13 founding states and pay for

her something...

On March 18, Stekl reported to our Ministry of Foreign Affairs about his conversation on March 14 with the Secretary of State. Seward then allegedly told him: "The President ... is not disposed to a deal, but will agree to it if I consider that this deal would be beneficial for the United States ..."

Perhaps Seward said something similar to Glass, but most likely with a wink: they say, this is for you to compile a dispatch to Russia.

Why I think so, the reader may already guess, but I will soon explain it more.

And then, according to Stekl, something like this conversation took place.

glass said:

Since the Congress has begun work, I would like to probe the opinion of some senators and members of the House, if you don't mind...

"I object," Seward protested at once, "these

conversations must be kept in the strictest confidence. Let's first see if we can reach an agreement. After that, it will be possible to consult with Congress.

- And what will be the price?

- Oh, quite decent - five million! Stekl (according to Stekl) shrugged his shoulders...

"We could even go up to five and a half million," the American hastily clarified, "but no more..."

"Well, we'll discuss that later," Stekl ended the conversation.

In a dispatch to Gorchakov, he wrote: *"I will strive to receive 6,500,000, or at least 6,000,000. I will continue negotiations and hope that I will be able to report something positive to Your Excellency within two weeks."*

So, Stekl wanted to assure his "colleagues" at the December "special meeting" that the United States was not that they do not show much interest in the Russian offer, but do not want to hear about the purchase at all.

But I don't trust Seward or Stekl here. I will remind the reader that Seward, during the Crimean War, declared in St. Paul, Minnesota: "Looking to the Northwest, I see a Russian who is preoccupied with building harbors, settlements and fortifications at the tip of this continent as outposts of St. Petersburg, and I can say: "Go on and build your outposts along the entire coast even to

of the Arctic Ocean, they will nevertheless become the outposts of my own country - the monuments of the civilization of the United States in the Northwest ... "

The words are arrogant, arrogant, conceited, but - what is essential - frank, and even spoken publicly! These words alone were enough to understand that the US elite is not only disloyal to Russia and Russians, but deeply, on the level of animal instinct, does not see them!

He hates because the USA was conceived, created and developed as the future Evil Empire.

And Russia - albeit tormented by all sorts of reuters - developed as a Country of universal Good.

No wonder Catherine the Great called her "the Universe"!

Can Evil not wish evil to Good?

This one speech by Seward was clear evidence of the great US interest in Russian America. It was enough for Stekl to remind Seward these words to at least drive even this insolent in the paint.

And also because Stekl did nothing of the kind, I believe in the authenticity of Stekl's dispatches

I don't believe in the essence of negotiations on the sale of Russian lands.

But it is quite reliable and beyond doubt that Seward on March 14 became so insolent that he asked Stekl that Russia use its influence in Denmark and persuade her to sell her possessions in the West Indies to the United States for \$ 5 million (this seems to have been a standard initial Yankee price for any land).

The annual export of the Danish colonies was 2 million thalers, and the Danes did not want to hear about the sale. Well, Seward decided to use Russia, which does not value its national wealth, as a free political intermediary in the matter of swindling the Danes.

But here even the complaisant (for the Yankees) Russian Foreign Ministry could not stand it, and soon Gorchakov restrainedly replied that Russia did not consider it possible for itself to recommend to Denmark the sale of its West Indian islands.

Tsarist Russia preferred to retain the exclusive right to sell its lands for next to nothing. And another oddity reveals the analysis of documents ...

Within the framework of a special meeting on December 16, it was decided: *"Mr. Stekl's long experience, as well as his acquaintance with American statesmen, will enable him to first consult with the senators and members of the House who are most directly interested in the possession of our colonies, and discuss this matter in confidence before formalizing it."*

But according to Stekl, Seward did not agree to such consultations. And why? Indeed, from the paper quoted above, prepared by Gorchakov, it directly followed that there was some kind of "pro-Alaskan" lobby in Congress. And it was a sin not to use his influence. Moreover, as follows from the same paper, Stekl was personally acquainted with the right people.

So why was this standard Yankee channel of influence not used? Isn't it strange?

I do not rule out that Stekl and Seward talked about the use of "lobby", but it was decided that there is nothing to knock on a supposedly closed door in advance. And so everything will be as planned for a long time ...

THE NEXT day after the official conversation on March 14 with Steckle, Seward made a report to the cabinet at its first meeting. And everyone immediately approved the "useless" purchase. Moreover, for a price of 7 million dollars (the secretary of state gave it to his colleagues as the limit).

With the price, by the way, it also turned out strange ... Reiter in St. Petersburg appointed an amount of 5 million. Her Seward named Glass as acceptable, raising the bid to no more than \$5,500,000.

Stekl promised in a dispatch to Gorchakov that he would seek 6,500,000, or at least 6,000,000. And suddenly, in Seward's report to the cabinet, 7 million come up, but even they did not become the limit - finally everything was coordinated for 7,200,000.

Without giving myself the trouble to puzzle over these transformations, I just pay attention to them.
reader.

March 15, 1867 fell on a Friday. And just after the weekend, on Monday, March 18, President Johnson signed formal credentials for Seward to negotiate. I note that in this way the American delegate at the talks had reliable, at any time verified by anyone, evidence that he had full rights to speak not on his own behalf, but on behalf of his country.

The issue of geographic boundaries was resolved at the State Department on the morning of March 19 by Seward at a meeting with US Coast Guard representative J.E. . Russian America was handed over "chokh" - leaving Russia nothing.

Even - the island of Lawrence ...

On the same day, at a new cabinet meeting, Seward submits for approval an agreed (!)
the text of the treaty, and on the same day it is approved.

I am not a connoisseur of the history of diplomacy, but it is unlikely that this record was surpassed anywhere and by anyone: all full-length (from the moment Seward was granted official authority) negotiations did not take even one day! Even Witte-"Polu-Sakhalin" slapped together the Portsmouth peace with Japan, although criminally fast, but significantly longer (this will be discussed in due time).

However, although everything was basically decided on March 19, it was not until March 25 that Stekl sent encrypted telegram, which began with the words: "*Negotiations ended ...*".

Although Seward was in a hurry (the next session of Congress ended on March 30), for some reason there was a certain hitch. It was caused by the fact that the US Secretary of State gave Stekl an official note of US consent to the purchase only on March 23, and a day later Stekl gave him his response note.

Why did Seward, who was breaking through, slow down a little here? I don't know for sure, but I can speculate. March 25 Western Style is March 13 Russian Style. And, perhaps, the desire *of someone* to once again play with *someone's favorite* number just explains the delay in the express
progress of almost a week.

In accordance with the decision of the special meeting on December 16, 1866, at the end of the negotiations, Stekl was to return to St. Petersburg "to report on the results of these negotiations." Then, presumably, it was supposed to provide him with written powers of the Seward type.

In fact, in a telegram dated March 13 in Russian style, he reported that "a simple telegraphic permission to sign a contract, as Seward told me, would correspond to formal
authority"...

Again, it is strange and hardly also often met and is found in international negotiation practice.

Nevertheless, on March 28 (16 Russian style) Alexander approved the draft reply telegram

Glass with permission to sell for 7 million and sign a contract.

Here I also have a number of questions for which I have no answers.

First... Why was it decided at first that Stekl would come to St. Petersburg in person, and then limited to telegraph exchange?

Second... The powers of the US Secretary of State were signed in full by the US President on official letterhead. And Stekl's "authority" was certified by the signature of the postal clerk on the telegraph form. Is this also the norm in international negotiation practice?

Third... Stekl's telegraphic correspondence with Russia was, of course, secret, that is, encrypted. Therefore, he could not even show part of the exact deciphered text (and not just the entire telegram!) to the Americans. This would be almost tantamount to issuing the cipher itself, because the telegrams went through the telegraph office of the State Department, and by comparing the ciphertext with a construction of at least two or three exact words from the telegram, standing one after another in exact sequence, one could find the key to the cipher. It turns out that Stekl's powers were confirmed, from a legal point of view, only by the words of Stekl himself. Is this also accepted in international practice?

BUT, SO or otherwise, the answer from Russia came on Friday, March 29th. And here I give the floor to Seward's son Frederick:

With a smile of satisfaction, Seward pushed the whist table away and said:

In less than 2 hours, the light was pouring from the windows of the State Department - work was going on there, as in the middle of the day. By 4 o'clock in the morning the contract was rewritten in beautiful handwriting, signed, sealed, sealed and ready to be sent to the Senate by the President.

March 29 was Friday, and at the latitude of Washington (slightly south of Yerevan) the weekend promised enough pleasure for those who indulged in it. And there was no reason to stay home on the evening before the weekend instead of going somewhere ...

However, the Secretary of State had no doubts about the readiness of the State Department apparatus to work. Why? Isn't that why that he knew very well about the receipt of the telegram and was waiting for the arrival of Stekl?

Moreover, Stekl's secretaries, too, were not tied to the thresholds of apartments on that cozy Washington evening. And here it is - everything quickly worked out.

So Frederick Seward, the son of William Henry Seward, may have simply lied, and his father and Glass had everything arranged in advance. And both were sure of a quick response from the Russian capital, since Stekl assured in a dispatch dated March 13 that Seward "met strong opposition in the office because of the agreed price and in order for the matter to be crowned with success, it is necessary to hurry" ...

By the way, about this ill-fated dispatch. It also contained the following words: "I am sending this telegram to at the request of Seward, who pays for it ..."

But when Seward was presented with a bill for \$9,886.5 (no doubt, a considerable amount in those prices!), the Secretary of State ... refused to pay, referring to the fact that he "cannot consider himself obliged to pay for the telegram to Prince Gorchakov, which he didn't sign or order."

Stekl reminded that there was an agreement - the State Department pays the cost of sending the dispatch, and the Russian government will pay for the answer.

But the contract was signed, and Seward was the full owner of his word: he gave it, he took it by right of ownership and took it back. The telegram was paid for by Stekl from the money received for Russian America - already on August 22, 1868, he laid out 10 thousand dollars in gold for it.

Such is the story from the old Russian-American history...

FURTHER there was a story with ratification - no less vile and unsightly ...

Firstly, the Yankees absolutely did not want to meet the insignificant wishes (not requirements) of St. Petersburg - including in the order of payment of money. (There was also an unworthy hassle with the payment itself, while Seward had the audacity - although why not? - to declare that he was "afraid to touch the honor (?! - S.K.) and the national pride of Americans" .)

On the other hand, the imperial government was not afraid of anything of the kind and did not hesitate to transfer the entire Russian colonial archive stored in Novo-Arkhangelsk to the possession of the United States. But these were not only valuable diplomatic, economic and historical documents, but also national relics.

Secondly, the whole story around ratification looks like a pre-planned and well-played performance - even though Academician Bolkhovitinov writes about a serious "struggle" for ratification.

But it seems to me that everything was much simpler, more unambiguous, and from this - even meaner.

So, at 4 o'clock in the morning the seals were put on the agreement on the sale of Russian America, and already at 10 o'clock in the morning the president sent it to the Senate for consideration for ratification. As the session of Congress ended that day, Johnson called an emergency executive session of the Senate.

In a secret report to Gorchakov dated April 3, Stekl reported: *"This document is subject to approval by the Senate, and the House of Representatives must then allocate funds to pay for purchases"*.

The standard cliché about how the Yankees bought Russian America from us, of which Alaska was only a part, is the assertion that the Senate was initially against the deal, and almost all American America raised an indignant uproar about the administration's waste of money.
to buy almost last year's snow.

But all this is malicious and vile nonsense. Not even a very careful study of even a small part of the documents and facts says the exact opposite.

I repeat - just the opposite!

The impression of America's rejection of the new territorial acquisition was immediately created by Stekl himself in his dispatches to the Russian Foreign Ministry. He sent a whole bunch of newspaper articles there with more than catchy headlines: "Seward's folly" ("Seward's folly"), "Seward's ice chest" ("Seward's ice box"), "Walrus Russia" ("Walrussia" from "walrus" - "walrus" and "Russia" - "Russia"), etc. and etc.

The most significant and "fragrant" in this heap were articles from the New York Tribune by Horace Grills.

Coming from a family of poor farmers, Greeley was then fifty-six years old, and he lived them stormily and chaotically: at the age of thirty in 1841, with the support of Seward (!) He founded this very New York Daily Tribune, opposed slavery, supported Lincoln, published Marx and Engels, was an opponent of the Kansas-Nebraska slave-owning bill, brought the circulation of his weekly to 200 thousand, lost almost half of his subscribers on the support, the ex-president of the slave-owning Confederate

States Davis (one of the initiators of the Kansas-Nebraska bill), and again criticized and criticized,

and if necessary - approved ...

A typical self-confident (in public) Yankee is a "self-made-man" ("a man who made himself") ... Although made it, of course, all these Davises and Swards ...

What about Marx's articles? Well, it's a tribute to "freedom", a handy fig leaf.

Bolkhovitinov writes about Greeley's "wit and high professionalism", but this professional social chameleon was a professional only in the matter of mass polluting the public consciousness with flat jokes and the most base feelings (we can't talk about thoughts here). Here is an excerpt from his article "Russian Quackery": "On paper there is no better place than Russian America. The climate is magnificent and quite warm in winter; ice fields are inexhaustible. And the Eskimos are looking for protection from the scorching heat of the Arctic summer ... The country is covered with pine forests, flowering green gardens along the coast, where there are also many walruses. Wheat, seals, barley, polar bears, seals, icebergs, whales and gold veins - all up to 60 north latitude ... "

You read and think: wasn't Greeley mocking the Russians and the "stupidity" of his former benefactor Seward, blessed by Seward himself? It was necessary to provide the appearance of a "discussion", and at the same time Stekl, with suitable "information"-disinformation materials for St. Petersburg.

And also - to give Bolkhovitinov's predecessor, the Soviet professor Semyon Bentsianovich Okun, the opportunity to support Stekl's version in his opus "Russian-American Company", published in 1939.

Although, as early as 1934, even an American, Professor Bailey, showed that most American newspapers were in favor of the purchase. Later it was estimated that about a third were against - fools have happened in America too. But even in the US South, nearly two-thirds of the newspapers carried favorable stories.

If only they were against it! In fact, the Yankees have long been eyeing the richest - in potential - Russian possessions. What are the ambitious speeches of Seward in St. Paul! We have more evidence...

The Smithsonian Institution, opened in 1846 with the support of John Quincy Adams with a bequest of one hundred thousand pounds sterling from the English chemist and mineralogist James Smithson, was at that time the largest research center in the United States, which no other American university could equal. And this complex scientific center has long been conducting thorough and detailed studies of the natural resources of Russian America.

That is, he conducted a smart, long-term, strategic collection of information with its subsequent qualified analysis and (there cannot be two competent opinions here!) Issuing relevant practical recommendations to the highest US authorities.

And a powerful real-time propaganda effect was provided by the same Collins, who was the author of the idea of the American-Russian telegraph. He is an expert who is quite knowledgeable - after agreeing *with* Seward, he published a memorandum in early April, where he emphasized the rich stocks of fish, timber, furs and ... gold in Russian America. Collins also spoke about the significant value of deliveries from Russian (from now on, alas, no longer Russian) America of "very clean ice" to California. There were no electric refrigerators back then!

The memorandum appeared in The New York Times, The New York Herald, The New York World, The Chicago Tribune...

Are comments needed here?

And I will simply add without comment that these same influential bodies, among other opinions in

support for the treaty was published by letters from General M.K. Migs and Commander J. Rogers. By the way, these letters were also published by the "opponent" of the purchase of Greeley.

Migs admitted: "The value of Russian America, its fish and mineral wealth exceeds the hot prairies of Mexico and the fertile plantations of Cuba.

And Rogers, who had studied the North Pacific for many years, noted "an insignificant (!!! - S.K.) purchase price" and emphasized that the United States "acquires a strip of coastline equal to Norway (this was an understatement, by the way, at times! - S.K.), which supplies almost the whole of Europe with timber.

If only *these* publications would be under the noses of the Reuters, Crabbe and Gorchakovs! Yes, they seem to know everything themselves quite well. And if they didn't know, then, showing official discrepancy and occupying the highest government posts, they were actually state criminals.

As, however, and their august bosses ...

The FIRST announcement of the treaty appeared as early as 4 p.m. on March 30 in the New York Commercial Advertiser, published by Seward's friend T. Weed. In the evening, the message was given to the Associated Press and circulated throughout the country.

Vida's newspaper wrote: "This acquisition more than doubles the Pacific coast of the United States... The territory to be ceded... includes a number of islands and is of great importance as a naval depot for strategic reasons. It is a valuable fur-bearing area and includes a huge territory, the possession of which will incline a vast territory in our favor.

Pacific trade...

Independently of her, the Philadelphia Inquirer said the same thing three days later: "The Alaska Peninsula and the Aleutian Islands can be very useful for any power with maritime interests ... The time will come when the possession of this territory will provide us with dominance in the Pacific Ocean."

The Chicago Evening Journal, doubting the current value of the newly acquired territory (but not denying, however, its trade prospects), also emphasized the strategic role of Russian America.

All of them, as we see, perfectly understood! And *we talked for joy!* Fish, furs, forests, refrigerated ice and even gold - that's right, big little things! But the strategic geopolitical significance of Russian America, taken over by the Yankees, was priceless! It was valued not by the weight of gold, but by the weight of future power and domination!

Moreover, the main bases of the Yankees could have (and then had) to the south - in the San Francisco zone. But more significant was the fact that now on the American Pacific coast such bases could not be have Russia!

And so I just shrugged my shoulders, reading Bolkhovitinov's statements that "the ratification of the treaty turned out to be by no means easy" ...

Only a complete political and geopolitical fool, having cast a glance at the already practically accurate map of the Pacific Ocean, did not envy Russia, which has the ability to block the entire Bering Sea with the Aleut barrier, stretching from Russian Chukotka to Russian Alaska, and control that notorious Northwest Passage from the Pacific Ocean to the Atlantic, which Cook "searched" and which Amundsen first passed at the beginning of the 20th century.

And the Yankees were very far-sighted in practical matters and ate a dog, an elephant and a donkey to boot!

Idiot tsars and literary Slavophiles indulged in empty and unrealizable dreams of the Black Sea straits. And under these dreams, Russia was losing the real, already

long-established control of the Bering Strait!

Eh!

IS it any wonder that the whole "struggle" in the Senate took only a week and a half. As early as April 7, Stekl, in a private letter to Gorchakov, stated: *"Mr. Sumner, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, came to ask me to withdraw from discussion the treaty, which, in his opinion, has no chance of approval. I flatly refused."*

Had the treaty been put to the vote immediately, it would have been rejected."

It was written on April 7th...

On April 10, the treaty was put to a vote, the result of which was: "for" ratification - 37 votes, "against" - 2.

N-yes...

Our leading expert on the problem was and remains Nikolay

Bolkhovitinov, why is he so often mentioned on these pages. But this expert, for the communication of many facts to whom I am grateful, in his assessments every now and then, to put it mildly, is far from being correct. Thus, he writes that Senator Sumner first proposed to Stekl that the treaty be removed from discussion, and only then "Sumner's views underwent a serious change."

But such a strange proposal by Sumner is known from a letter from Stoeckl. Can you trust him words? After all, they often have a "double bottom"!

In fact, Sumner was one of the active supporters of the speedy ratification of (actually, she had almost no opponents).

On the morning of April 8, Sumner, at a meeting of the Foreign Affairs Committee, proposes that the treaty be submitted to the Senate for approval. Of the eight committee members, six were in favor (against) were Fessenden of Maine and Patterson of New Hampshire.

At 13 (what are you going to do with that "13"!) on April 8, Sumner begins his three-hour speech before the Senate.

The "discussion" took one day - April 9th. Again, a couple of senators opposed - Fessenden and Ferry from Connecticut.

And on the same day, the purchase of Russian America was approved by the Senate with the result known to us votes - 37 "for" and 2 "against" - the same Fessenden and Morrill from Vermont ...

In total, only one Fessenden was strongly opposed all the time.

Well, where is the slightest struggle and opposition seen here?

The AMOUNT of the transaction amounted to 7 million 200 thousand dollars (slightly more than 11 million rubles).

In the year when the question of the sale was raised by Konstantin (in the sense that certain forces "posed" this question to the Grand Duke), that is, in the year 1857, the budget of the Ministry of the Imperial Court "pulled" 11 million 653 thousand 600 rubles .

In 1867, this budget of royal idlers and their lackeys was determined at 10 million 933 thousand 500 rubles.

The revenues of the state budget of the Russian Empire in the same year amounted to almost 439 million rubles. So, the sale of Russian America increased the revenues of the Russian budget by only two

half a percent in a single year!

Great profit, nothing to say!

The Yankees, having laid out only seven million dollars, received Russian America and provided themselves with prospects for Pacific power due to the voluntary geopolitical castration of Russia.

Even Mexico - for New Mexico, Upper California and Texas - was paid by the Americans in 1848 under the Treaty of Guadalupe - Hidalgo 15 million more expensive than dollars. Although these were territories belonging to a weak country, and their potential belonging to the United States looked quite natural, just because the border between the United States and Mexico along the Rio Grande looked quite natural.

Yes, plus the Yankees then had to pay 3 million 250 thousand compensation to their own citizens.

Total - more than 18 million.

England in the Alabama case paid the United States fifteen and a half million dollars in 1872. And for what!

During the Civil War of the North and South, by order of the Confederation of the States of America - the state union of southern slave owners, the Alabama sailing and steam cruiser was built and equipped in England, which effectively waged a war of marque and sank either 53 or even 70 ships of the northern states before being sunk by the Kearsarge corvette.

The total damage from the actions of the Alabama and twelve other British Confederate cruisers construction amounted to more than 19 million dollars.

So, after the war, the Yankees raised a universal fuss, demanding that England pay them compensation of \$ 15.5 million for the fact that their ships were sunk by a ship built by the British. Not an English ship, but a ship, only, I repeat, built by the British.

Claims - in my opinion, worthy of a madman, however, a special arbitration court in Geneva ruled in favor of the United States, and this decision became the basis of the Washington rules of neutrality (later recklessly, of course, violated primarily by the Yankees themselves).

And here for the unheard of national humiliation - and not a one-time, but eternal! - Russia barely got 7 million! But the influential Washington lawyer, former Treasury Secretary R. J. Walker, in July 1868, called the purchase of Russian America "the greatest act" of the Johnson-Seward administration. He wrote to Seward: *"The theater of our greatest triumphs is to be the Pacific Ocean, where we will soon have no formidable European rival. The end result will be political and commercial control of the world."*

Such are "isolationist" and at the same time "friendly to Russia" thoughts and feelings.:

And this Walker was at the same time a lawyer for the Russian mission in Washington and "helped" Stekl (for \$26,000 in gold) "persuade" the senators to "agree" to the purchase.

Like this!

By the way, about compensations and rewards ... On Stekl's report dated April 7 (19), Alexander wrote with his own hand: "For everything he did, he deserved a special" thank you "from my sides."

And the best friend of the Rothschilds and Stieglitz, Minister of Finance Reiter allocated from the treasury - for rewards for Stekl and Bodisko - neither more nor less, but exactly 30 thousand rubles!

At least cut me, dear reader, but I am sure that the number zta was taken by him intentionally - as symbolic. He would, of course, be more willing to authorize the payment of 30 pieces of silver directly, but this currency was in circulation only in biblical times.

Glass, presumably, was not offended by the other side either, and he himself somehow "warmed up" in the process of paying for the purchase of his hand. However, the baron was "offended" - especially since he personally had only 25 thousand (5 received Bodisko). But after all, Judas was here, it seems, two - the envoy and the secretary of the mission.

SOON the "act of sale" was "ratified" by Alexander - for himself, as well as "for ... the heirs and successors."

As the record on the original treaty testified, "imperial ratification" was given "on May 3 in the summer of the Nativity of Christ one thousand eight hundred and sixty-seven, while our reign in thirteenth"...

And so often this symbolic devil's dozen is put into action here that you think: maybe did they, these *certain people*, specifically date everything precisely for the thirteenth year of the reign?

God knows them...

Especially since only the devil knows!

Officially, Russian America was now bought and sold, although the transfer ceremony did not take place until the autumn of 1867. But even this fall, the US budget spending on the "Russian" purchase has not yet been approved by the House of Representatives.

And in the spring of this year, the tsar - having fun every now and then to frivolous tears, accepted the invitation of Napoleon III to visit the Paris Exhibition and moved there with his family and retinue (there is a profit from the sale, you can take a walk!).

Before reaching Paris, Alexander telegraphed an order to the Russian embassy: to order a box for him at the Variety, where the operetta *Duchesse de Gerolstein* was playing - even though Catherine the Great was presented in an indecent form in it.

We went to the Variety immediately after dinner with the French emperor ...

Was there, by the way, and the eldest daughter of Nicholas I, forty-eight-year-old Grand Duchess Maria Nikolaevna - President of the Academy of Arts. And her friend, Maria Vasilievna Vorontsova (nee Trubetskaya), told her: "Masha, shame on you, because she is a great empress!"

Tell Alexander that it's ugly to visit a Parisian booth, where even at the time of arrival the Russian tsar is given an anti-Russian operetta disgracing his great-grandmother, no one, of course, could.

And he himself did not understand this.

Did not understand!!!

You see, my dear reader, not a little...

So did his soul ache for some distant Russian America that they had never seen in their eyes?

Chapter 10

After sale...

March 31 Associated Press TELEGRAPH message on US purchase of Russian America was stunned by both Americans and Russians (everyone else, and especially the British, however, too).

But if the Yankees were stunned with joy, then the Russians, although they also did not believe their eyes, reading this message, but they didn't believe it because it simply didn't fit in the head - let alone in the heart!

The newspaper of the publisher of Otechestvennye Zapiski, Andrei Aleksandrovich Kraevsky, Golos, even a few days after receiving the message from Washington, in its issue of March 23 (April 4), called it "an incredible rumor" and "a cruel joke on the gullibility of society."

In the issue dated April 6, "Voice" wrote: "The beginning is hard: today rumors are selling railroad, tomorrow - Russian American colonies; who can guarantee that tomorrow the same the very rumors of selling the Crimea, Transcaucasia, Ostsee provinces? There will be no business for hunters ... What a huge mistake and imprudence was the sale of our Ross colony on the coast of gold-bearing California; Is it permissible to repeat such a mistake now? And is it really the feeling of national pride that deserves so little attention that it could be donated for some 5-6 million dollars? Should foreigners really use the labors of Shelikhov, Baranov, Khlebnikov and other selfless people for Russia and collect their fruits for their own benefit? No, resolutely

We refuse to believe these ridiculous rumors.

But it wasn't a rumor...

The "Voice" was outraged openly and in real time, but the cautious Minister of Internal Affairs Pyotr Alexandrovich Valuev wrote in his diary on March 22 (April 3) only for distant descendants: "We have received news of the cession of our American possessions ... None of us about *this did not know, except for the book. Gorchakov, Minister of Finance and Crabbe. A strange phenomenon and a painful impression... We are secretly selling part of our territory...*"

In Europe, everyone was surprised and sometimes they even pitied us from surprise. The Independence Belge hastily wrote the truth: "As for Russia, it is difficult to explain the reasons that prompted her to cede her colonies in America to the Americans, since they are the key to the Bering Strait and always stubbornly defended it."

Russian America was actually the key to the entire Pacific Ocean, where completely new geopolitical conditions were already beginning to take shape at that time. After all, in Japan in the following year, 1868, that era of deep reforms was opened - the "Meiji revolution", about which the author will tell the reader in some detail in due time.

SO what was it - stupidity, historical blindness or cold, as if deliberate crime?

Or maybe just skinning? Mikhail Ivanovich Venyukov, Russian geographer and ethnographer, graduate of the Academy of the General Staff, member of the Russian Geographical Society since 1859 (from the age of 27), member of the geographical societies of England, France, Switzerland, explorer of the Far East, Amur, Tien Shan, Caucasus, was a man clearly well informed. In 1877 he emigrated from Russia, and in 1895-1901 he published his memoirs - uncensored, in Amsterdam, where, in particular, he reported that

RAC shareholders, after the publication of the fact of the sale, were engaged in speculative fraud with the company's shares with might and main in order to get more from the treasury for them, and the Grand Duke especially distinguished himself in this Konstantin...

I think here, as in any major event, there was enough of everything.

After all, the RAC, like the rest of "elite" Russia, also gradually degenerated, and in the future, under such "kings" and their ministers, it could not maintain itself as a national phenomenon. After all, this is the grandson of Alexander II - Nicholas II, and the spiritual descendants of the Krabbe and Reuters thirty years later led Russia to the adventure of the Chinese Eastern Railway, the CER, and to the mediocre Port Arthur "project". However, I'm getting ahead of myself here...

But here's what's for sure - it's the complete inconsistency of Academician Bolkhovitinov's statements about the fact that "all far-reaching" hypotheses "and" assumptions "about the secret motives of the" shameful decision ", including bribery of persons from Alexander II's entourage, fall away" ...

How does it "fall away"? Vice versa! The study of the problem is inevitable, as the confluence of the branches of the Volga delta into the Caspian Sea, suggests a conspiracy of external anti-Russian forces and their internal agents of influence in order to exclude future conditions of power in the Pacific Ocean for Russia and ensure America's dominance there.

It was a long-standing, long-formed conspiracy ... I previously expressed my deep conviction that Cook's third voyage was primarily a strategic reconnaissance action. And was Cook alone acting here as an agent of the West?

The outside world, and especially the supranational forces, were very worried about the question: "What is there, in the mysterious Russian north?" Academician Vernadsky, in the "Essays on the History of *Natural Science* in Russia" already mentioned by me, wrote well about this: to the north so far that they finally came to warm countries "... Much later - after not only the Bering expedition, but also the Great Northern Expedition, in the second half of the 18th century - a number of scientists (and only scientists! - S.K.) ... believed that there were warm countries near the pole, that a northeastern passage to India could be found, and that only political considerations ... Russians hide reality, and academicians Gmelin, Miller and others (that is, members of the Russian Academy of Sciences. - S.K.)

knowingly wrote false ... "

Envious and unreasonably suspicious, measuring everything according to its own selfish yardstick, hating Russia precisely for what the natural German Empress Catherine called her "the Universe", the West could not leave us alone and could not but oppose our rise.

Around the time of the same Cook, "a leading professor at the University of Edinburgh and a royal historiographer for Scotland" William Robertson went to Russia to collect materials for some reason not on the history of the Russian imperial court, but on the geographical discoveries of Russians in northwestern America ...

About the Englishman Billings and his colleague on the third voyage of Cook, the American John Ledyard, who made a reconnaissance "journey" to Siberia in 1887-1888, I wrote.

And here is the strange figure of another Englishman - Macmestra. Nine years went to the East Indies, then settled in Hamburg, married, gave birth to five children. And suddenly, with the recommendation of the Russian chargé d'affaires in Hamburg and Hannover, Forsman appeared in 1801 to the RAC board and offered his services, having spoken from three boxes ... He undertook to raise the Kuriles, and was ready to help Baranov in Kodiak, and spoke about the weaknesses of English trade, and left as a pledge his wife and children in St. Petersburg, and half

He was ready to leave the requested salary (considerable - 15 thousand rubles a year) in the company with its shares, and was ready to enter into Russian citizenship ...

Then his trail is lost... Adventurer? Perhaps ... But I see it in him too (forgive the author the reader is so suspicious!) Another English intelligence officer ...

And what about the strange deaths of the luminaries of Russian America?

And what about the "conventional" passions around her at the end of the reign of Alexander the First?

What about the Monroe Doctrine?

And the ominous figures of Nesselrode and all those reuters and crabs?

And what about the oddities with the "clip" of the three "Russian" envoys in quotation marks?

About two of them - Bodisco and Glass, I have already said enough,

but - not all already because he has not yet said that they turned out to be absolute champions in terms of the length of stay in the United States among Russian pre-revolutionary diplomatic representatives - 17 and 14 years respectively.

Before and after them, a typical period is two to four years, rarely seven. And they stayed in the United States for many more than ten years, and only one more person, Pavel Andreevich von Kridener, crossed this ten-year milestone besides them ...

I INTENTIONALLY did not say anything about him when it was about the era in which this descendant of an old German family, dating back to the 14th century, represented Russia overseas.

This era was the reign of Nicholas I, which can also be called the era of Charles Nesselrode...

And at the very beginning of the accession of Nicholas (Karl "reigned" for several years), on July 15, 1826, Kridener was appointed Russian envoy to the United States with the task of "perpetuating the consent that characterizes their real relationship." Nesselrode, in his instructions, pointed out to him "coincidence of interests and reciprocity in benefits", as well as the fact that "between Russia and the United States there is an alliance that we consider it necessary to develop."

Kridener and developed, actively facilitating the conclusion of that Russian-American trade agreement 1832, which consolidated the "conventional" robbery of Russian America.

In 1828, the Yankees established customs tariffs, later called "Tarif of Abominations" - "tariffs of the absurd" ("abomination" also means "horror, abomination, disgust"). They accounted for 37-49% of the cost of imported goods. Moreover, even goods were subject to tariffs of absurdity, in the United States not produced and, therefore, did not compete with domestic producers.

Russian exports especially suffered from this, and so Kridener allegedly actively sought the abolition of tariffs and achieved it by 1932. And then he concluded a trade agreement with the Yankees. All this again resembles a game, disgusting, all the more so since Russia, through the efforts

Kridener in 1830 played a decisive role in the conclusion of the US treaty with the Turks, which provided the Yankees with favorable trading positions in Turkey and the Black Sea.

Eleven years of Kridener's mission to the United States are very important years that determined a lot in the future fall of RAC and Russian America. And was it just a coincidence?

Pavel Kridener was the son of the Russian envoy to Denmark, Alexei Ivanovich Kridener, and the mystical acquaintance of Emperor Alexander the First, Julia Kridener. Kridener's influence on the king

was extremely negative psychologically, but how she influenced him politically -

hard to say...

But to me, to some extent, she seems to me to be something like what Elena Bonner was for the nuclear physicist Andrei Sakharov - a kind of hypnotizing lady who suppresses the person who trusted her and imposes her will on him - not her own, but the will of those whose will she fulfills.

Here is the son of such a mother and represented Russia in the USA when America was preparing for a new rise - including at the expense of Russia.

Kridener was replaced by Bodisco.

And Bodisco - Glass ...

NO, it's up to you, but so many different kinds of "fog" have hung around Russian America from its very beginning Anglo-Saxon and *some other* origin, which is far from him and the famous fog London...

And no one now, after my own analysis of the history of Russian America, will convince me that in the final part of it was also not without thick fog and cleverly placed smoke screens!

One sale of the island of St. Lawrence here turns out to be the awl that sticks out of the bag and pricks the eyes with the frank truth about the sale of Russian America: yes, this is a dirty deal, collusion, a deliberate betrayal by someone from the elite of Russia's national interests ...

Already Lavrenty something in the contract could not be included!

And Lavrenty does not fit into the version that the Yankees wanted to squeeze Alaska into geopolitical "pincers" of the British in Canada.

More than ten years had passed since the sale, and on February 17, 1870, Marx wrote from London to his friend Ludwig Kugelmann in Hanover about a certain unfortunate analyst Gottfried Kinkel: "In his eyes, the cession of the Russian part of North America was nothing more than a diplomatic cunning of the Russian *government* (yes! - S.K.) ... *But the main thing is this: the American Congress recently published documents about this deal. There is, by the way, a report by an American attorney who writes directly to Washington: from the economic point of view, this acquisition does not yet cost a cent, but thanks to this, the Yankees, on the one hand, cut off England from the sea and hasten the annexation of all British North America to the USA. That's where the dog is buried.*"

It was hardly possible to recklessly trust the "documents" of the congress (all the more so since Marx was familiar with them, according to some sources, in the presentation of The Times), but what is valuable and true in Marx's message, first of all, is that it shows an active, enterprising US attitude to the problem.

But we are continually being told that the initiative came from Russia, from Konstantin...

It turns out - no! The Russian official elite (the same Konstantin) was simply cleverly pushed towards idiotic and treacherous (from the point of view of Russia's national interests) initiatives. The original Others gave impetus to the process ...

Alexander the Third, when he was heir to the throne, in 1879, wrote about his uncle: "*The Admiral-General does what others drive into his head. It just takes anger to deal with such people.*" That's exactly what it is, that's for sure...

And one more thing... Marx vainly trusted the assurances that the deal was economically worthless for the United States - one pure ice for Californian meat carcasses was worth something on the cheap ... But there was also pure gold!

But what is true - the Yankees did not particularly strive to develop the new territories they inherited (I mean this

I'll be back in a moment), and therefore it was then profitable for them to publicly declare that the grapes were small ...

Further... Such publications of "congress documents" indirectly raised the authority of the Russian tsar - they say, by selling he undermined the power of Russia's eternal antagonist - England. Although Canada - contrary to the predictions of Marx and not only him - never became a legally new state of the United States.

So "the dog was buried" not in the desire to deprive England of its overseas dominion (Canada became it just in the year of the sale of Russian America - in 1867). The dog was buried precisely in the deprivation of Russia of that part of the American continent, which gave Russia a fundamentally different look not only in the Pacific Ocean, but also on the entire geopolitical map of the world.

Marx did not understand this. And no longer in the development of thought, but just like that, "in the appendage", I will cite such a detail from his letter of 1870 ... He wrote to Kugelman that the ruble exchange rate on the London Stock Exchange fell to 28-29 pence at a rate of 40 pence. And that was one of the reasons. that due to the competition of American grains on the world market, the export of grains from Russia was reduced by one third.

Just one quote referring to the sale of Russian America. But how it mixes the exact and the erroneous, the genuine and the feigned. And this is for lighting (or - dimming?) Problems are very typical.

HERE IS ANOTHER side of it - the Aleuts ...

The Dictionary of American History from Colonial Times to the First World War, 1997 edition, edited by Academician Fursenko, reports that the Aleuts (self-name - Unangans) by the middle of the 18th century had a population of "from 10 to 25 thousand people."

And already this initial figure makes it possible for any manipulations. If at the beginning of the Shelikhov era there were, say, actually 10 thousand Aleuts, and after fifty years it actually became 15 thousand, then it can still be said that the Russians exterminated the Aleuts in masses, if we accept their initial (according to Fursenko) number of 25 thousand people .

Therefore, one should not be surprised that the same source says: "The Aleuts, who achieved high perfection in sea crafts, became the object of cruel exploitation by Russian merchants, as a result of which the islands were depopulated (about 2.5 thousand people by 1834) ".

Well, not Russians, but just cannibals - at least give them to the Nuremberg Tribunal!

Another neo-"Petersburger", Professor Andrey Grinev, published in the 8th issue of the journal "Questions of History" for 2003 an article entitled "The nature of the relationship between Russian colonialists and Alaska natives", where a lot is spread about the brutal beating by Russian industrialists Aleuts.

In fact, the Aleutian Islands are not Alaska, but the Aleutian Islands. But the professor has a doctorate in history, not geography, so what is there ... Especially since he writes about unsightly stories - and even with links to the archives of the Russian Geographical Society, to Sarychev, Golovnin, Khvostov and Davydov known to us ...

Russian leader Ivan Solovyov looks like a cold sadist in Grinev's portrayal. In order to check on which person the bullet would stop, Solovyov allegedly shot through twelve Aleuts tied together. How can you tie twelve (!) people in a row, and even so that they stand on the line when they are killed, the professor does not think. And he does not bother to ask: how reliable are the information he uses I.E. Veniaminov, the author of the 1840 work "Notes on the Islands of the Unalashka Department", who lived seventy-five years after Solovyov? And did certain "old Aleuts" say everything to such "informants"?

Grinev gives the figures of the Aleuts allegedly "destroyed by Solovyov" on the Fox Islands alone - either three, or five thousand people (with the reservation, however, that some researchers consider these figures to be clearly exaggerated). But with such a scale of beating, Solovyov simply would not have had a gunpowder supply for sea beavers!

Without hesitation, Grinev also mentions that "Report of the navigator Ivan Solovyov to Ensign T.N. Shmalev" from the 1948 edition, which I also quoted in Chapter 2 ...

But it only mentions...

Still would! If you read it all, then the professorial accusations somehow immediately become unconvincing and dubious. Sorry, I can not give this "report" in full. However, here is a small representative part of it that describes the situation ...

Former "interpreters"-Aleuts of Solovyov - Agyuyak and Kashmak, who went out to the Russians voluntarily, told the guests about the beating of **Russians by the Aleuts**, and warned, among other things, about this: "Toens (that is, foremen, leaders. - S.K.) islands ... men (that is, ordinary Aleuts. - S.K.) were persuaded: how would the Russians come and if they safely land on the ground and settle on our islands, until they live together, then don't go hiking on them, we're good luck will not, but first we will live together; but as soon as they disperse into artels for fishing, then we'll launch an attack all of a sudden, so that they can't send news from one artel to another, and so by the deception of the Russian coup we can kill everyone without a trace ... "

Like this...

Having written this, Solovyov further admitted: "And as soon as I heard about such trouble, I began to live much carefully..."

Ivan Solovyov was not a professor and an educated person. He did not even use European maritime terminology and wrote in his "report" as follows: "Kursh (course. - S.K.) -east and wind from the southeast. - S.K.) ... ", " Curonian ... between the west and the sholonik (southwest wind. - S.K.) ... " And the Russian leader did not assume that his clumsy (from the point of calligraphy, but not of style), the lines will be studied by scientists and quasi-scientists in centuries to come... Therefore, he obviously wrote sincerely - about what he did and what he thought. And here - there is no hint of contempt for the Aleuts in his story, there is no self-admiration. Here he writes about one of his trips and honestly reports: "But I didn't see any pranks on that trip from the local peoples, because, protecting myself, I had a strong

precaution".

Solovyov also describes skirmishes with the Aleuts. After all, it was not a movie - it was life, life in tough and cruel times. But from the very beginning, Ivan the leader had only 55 people (of which 13 were Kamchadals), and 28 people died from diseases. The Aleuts, by the way, knew how to skillfully beat the sentry sea animal. If they were opposed by a handful of greedy killers, then the islanders would hardly have allowed her to exterminate themselves by the thousands (!).

No, the new Russian academicians and professors enthusiastically assure us that our ancestors were no better in their behavior with the natives of the places they colonized than the Anglo-Saxons, Spaniards and other Europeans in their colonies. That the natives of North-West America were mercilessly (and even for fun) beaten out by the Russians the way the Yankees did it on the other side of America ...

But was it really like that?

FIRST, it is unlikely that at the best of times there were more than 10 thousand indigenous people in the Aleuts - there are reasons to believe so, because more or less reliable censuses of the 19th century are not approaching

even to this figure, and at the same time in different periods of the 20-40s, the data are quite stable at the level of 5-8 thousand people. In the internal, "sociable" note of the RAC dated December 23, Russian style, 1816, it is reported that in 1806 "more than 20 thousand souls of both sexes were considered to be baptized Aleuts and Americans." But here the mainland natives (of which there were more) are also taken into account, and not just the islanders ...

The Fursenko team reports two and a half thousand Aleuts by 1834, but there is evidence of about 6 thousand of them in the same years. Nevertheless, what about the main accusation by historians of Shelikhov's associates in fact of genocide?

Let's try to figure this out...

In a difficult for Russia, but already firmly victorious 1944 in Leningrad, in the publishing house of the Academy sciences of the USSR, a collection of materials "Russian discoveries in the Pacific Ocean and North

America in the 18th-19th centuries"... Today it is already a double document of two epochs: the era of defending the interests of Eternal Russia in Russian America and the era of defending the interests of Soviet Russia during Great Patriotic War...

So, the period May 5, 1786 - April 1787 is dated "G.I. Shelekhov the main ruler K.A. Samoilov "...

Direct citation of documents of the 18th century is complicated by the ponderous language of that time - read they are difficult, although interesting. However, I will quote something directly ...

The second paragraph of the instruction began as follows: *"In order to strengthen the Russian company of our people in this region (in the Aleuts and Alaska. - S.K.), try through all sorts of indulgence of civilians, Aleksinians, Kinanians, and Chugachs to bring citizenship to the perfect Russian imperial throne ... "*

Arrogant and cruel newcomers, as they grow stronger, tend to suppress the natives, and Shelikhov speaks of "indulgence" as they "strengthen" ... Something does not fit in with the accusations of the Fursenko dictionary ...

And from the third point:

And from the fourth point:

And, finally, from the fifth point (but far from the last):

Well, dear reader, how is something clearing up about the policy of the Russian merchant Shelikhov?

However, the Russians, alas, had to kill the natives. Because they - as mentioned above - killed the Russians. The natives of the Aleutian Islands and Alaska were far from always friendly due to what scientists call "xenophobia", that is, unmotivated rejection of the alien. On April 19, 1787, Shelikhov, in his report "To His Excellency, Mr. General Lieutenant, the Governor General of Irkutsk and Kolyvan, and various orders, Cavalier Ivan Varfolomeevich Yakobiy from sea voyages of the North-Eastern Ocean, the companion of the Rylsk merchant Grigory Shelikhov" wrote:

"In the discussion of a crowded number (Shelikhov had about a hundred Russians. - S.K.) living on ... the islands ... of various non-peaceful peoples, also due to ... the dampness of the sea air of scurvy, there were all sorts of obstacles that I was forced to endure with a cheerful spirit and by all means ... But with all such ... weakness, from the brutal attacks attempted by the inhabiting peoples on us, it was necessary to have an unsleeping eye on all caution and defense without

fear and fatigue.

Grigory Ivanovich wrote further that although "the local peoples ... often and strongly crowded on us

attacked", but the Russians always successfully fought back.

Actually, Shelikhov had the same problems as Solov'yov and his other predecessors. The Aleuts attacked the industrialists and "working people", "trying to make robbery attacks at night and in heavy rain and wind", but the Shelikhovites were very patient, although Shelikhov honestly admitted to Jacobi that "at the same time, our public side was not without extremes in every possible way".

Of course, it was not always possible to restrain oneself in that situation, but, "by a possible interpretation through the interpreters, caressing", the Russians convinced the Aleuts, "so that they, having no hesitation about anything, treat us friendly."

Such is the "genocide".

By the way, "Report" by Shelikhov Jacobi was taken by me from another collection of materials "Russian discoveries in the Pacific Ocean and North America in the 18th century", published in 1948 by the State Publishing House of Geographical Literature on the 200th anniversary of the birth of Grigory Ivanovich and dedicated to his memory ... So Soviet Russia honored the name of the glorious son of Eternal Russia ...

Shelikhov was not an ordinary merchant, just as Baranov was not just a merchant. They were people of broad statesmanship, and for this reason alone, from the very beginning of Russian America, there could be no place for anything resembling a deliberate genocide. The diversion of the male population of Alaska and the Aleut to the RAK fisheries led at some moments to a half-starvation situation among the natives, but it was difficult to correct something here. There were no party committees in the trading posts of the RAC, and its directors were far from the ideas of social justice ...

And personally, I don't blame them for this - in the time of Shelikhov and Baranov, capitalism has not yet turned into either an obstacle to the progress of mankind - as at the beginning of the First World War, or into that living, stinking corpse that it became by the beginning of the 21st century.

On the other hand, in the early years of Russian America, the Aleuts themselves lived in such a way that they could not count on a special prosperity and a particularly long life expectancy. Here is how Lisiansky described their life in 1804:

Such a "closed cycle" - almost like astronauts ...

Of course, the complex composition of urine also determines its certain aseptic properties, but nevertheless, the hygiene regimen among the Aleuts was somewhat peculiar ...

With such "hygiene", plus when venereal Yankees with their alcohol penetrate into this Pacific zone - and don't die!

Here, in addition to what has been said, is an example, geographically a little different, but civilizationally similar ... Gilyaks (Nivkhs) have long inhabited the lower reaches of the Amur and Sakhalin. And in his "Sakhalin Island", written in 1890, Chekhov (he himself, I remind you, a doctor) reported: "We have no direct observations on the soreness of Gilyaks. But you can get some idea about it by the presence of pathogenic causes, like untidiness, immoderate alcohol consumption, long-term communication with the Chinese and Japanese ... Our Amur foreigners and Kamchadals got syphilis from the Chinese and Japanese, but the Russians are not here with what..."

I apologize to the reader for these details, but all sorts of academics, ready to see a mote in the eye of our ancestors, not noticing the Yankees and logs ...

With the general systemic degradation of Russia in the 19th century, the social atmosphere in the possessions of the RAC in Russian America was unlikely to improve, but even the tightening of the position of the natives subject to the RAC did not cause their extinction.

On the contrary, the great smallpox epidemic of 1835-1840, which came to Russian America from the south, from English possessions, affected the Aleuts to the least extent. And precisely because they were most closely associated with CANCER, they were more willing to get vaccinated.

Nevertheless, in the 18th century there were probably more than 10 thousand Aleuts, and in the 19th century there were never so many of them. So - the genocide still turns out, was there?

Yes, I'm sure yes! But the reason was not in the inhumanity of RAK, but in something else.

In what?

Well, of course, in the activities of the "Bostonians" and other Anglo-Saxon "civilizers". These moral freaks loved to kill not only for profit, but simply for the sake of killing - it is enough to recall the huge herds of bison they knocked out in a matter of decades.

But they loved profit even more, and what could be more profitable than getting a beaver skin for "fire water"? And the fact that the Aleut gets drunk and soon dies is his problem.

What about firearms? After all, it was used by the natives not only in the fields and - in the first Russian-American period - against the Russians, but at some points - against each other in **traditional** feuds. That did not increase the number of Aleuts.

And the "Bostonians" also carried guns ...

About the role of the Anglo-Saxons, who brazenly, although thievishly penetrated into Russian America, the current "historians" who feed on Yankee grants, of course, keep quiet or speak in passing. And it was also more convenient for the "historians of the Central Committee of the CPSU" (in fact, the same "Russian" historians before repainting) to blame everything on damned tsarism ...

But it was not the Russians who exterminated the Aleuts. If this were so, then one Russian employee of the RAC could not manage a remote island trading post for many years! Manage while living surrounded by the same Aleuts...

By the twenties of the 19th century, there were already some statistics in the Russian colonies in America. So, in according to it, 448 Russians, 553 Creoles, 5334 Aleuts, 1432 Kenais and 479 Chugachs lived there.

This, of course, is not the entire population of Alaska, but only that part of it that was directly connected with Russian settlements. However, there are few Russians here. According to modern ideas, a handful. But this - only modern...

For comparison, I will cite the data of the official census of the population of Alaska in 1880 - when it had already been a "US territory" for thirteen years: 392 whites, 1683 mestizos, 1960 Aleuts, 17,488 Eskimos, 8655 Indians (data from a "live", in real edition, Dictionary of Brockhaus and Efron).

But the data are intermediate ... In 1860, there were 12,007 Christians in Russian America, among them: Russians - 784 (576 men and 208 women), Creoles - 1676 (853 and 823), Aleuts - 4391, Kuskokuigmuths - 1395 ...

But not all Aleuts were Orthodox!

An attentive reader may notice that in 1806, according to RAC estimates, baptized natives there were up to 20 thousand, and by 1860 there were fewer of them by 8 thousand ...

"Aha!" someone will say...

Yes, not really "aha" ... Firstly, the RAC figure of 1806 is most likely overestimated for obvious reasons - if in recent times the quality of work was assessed by the number accepted into the CPSU, then in

at that time they were glad to boast of the growth of believers in Christ ...

Secondly, the "English" smallpox had a strong effect on the population of Russian America.

And, finally, the year 1860 is already the time of an unnatural, but real decline as a Russian America, and our influence there. Including - and the influence of the spiritual, religious.

By the way, according to the dictionary of Academician Fursenko, since 1834, when there were, according to him, only 2500 Aleuts, the growth in the number of Aleuts in Russian America over a quarter of a century amounted to at least 175 percent with their number of 4391 people! Well, "extinction" ... Although, of course, there was not even much growth, because the above "academic" figure is clearly false.

But if we compare the fairly accurate Russian church data of 1860 and the fairly accurate data of the American census of 1880, we see that after the transition of these territories to the Yankees, the number of Aleuts did not increase, but decreased. And - sharply, more than twice. The Yankees are not Russian, they are generous in paying for lies (and even then not always), but they do not like the truth. But the truth is that just with the accession of the Yankees, the Aleuts quickly degraded, they were really cruelly and for a song exploited by the Alaska Commercial Company even at the beginning of the 20th century ... Then the Yankee genocide stopped - after all, they began to consider even blacks people, and by 1939 year, the number of Aleuts was about 5600 people. As you can see, even under conditions that completely allow their numbers to grow, it was about the same as in the days of the RAC.

In 1942, a real story, there was a war in the Pacific. The Japanese captured the Aleutian island of Attu. The Americans began to deploy naval bases in the Aleutian Islands, and all the Aleuts were forcibly evicted from there to the Admiralty Island in the Alexander Archipelago. But for some reason, Academician Fursenko's dictionary of the 1997 edition is silent about this.

Just as the above-mentioned Professor Andrey Grinev "forgets" about the impression that the relationship between Russians and natives left on a completely outside (and not very disposed to Russian) observer. I mean Captain Vancouver, known to us, who, I remind you, was struck by the "calmness and good harmony in which they (that is, we Russians. - S.K.) live *among* the rudest sons of nature ... gaining love by their favorable treatment".

No, a good memory of the Russian Aleuts, and indeed the entire population of the now former Russian America preserved firmly, and the spiritual Russian influence took root deeply.

THERE ARE TWO testimonies that came across to me as if by order, but I came to which I was far from

straightaway...

One was found in the book of a participant in the first Russian expeditions on the icebreakers "Taimyr" and "Vaigach" before the First World War, doctor Leonid Mikhailovich Starokadomsky "Five voyages in the Arctic Ocean." I will refer to it more than once later.

And here is what Starokadomsky wrote about the entry of our icebreakers to Alaska in October 1913:

"After consulting with the officers, the head of the expedition decided to go to the small, but closed from the south winds, the village of San Michel (a coastal village near the mouth of the Yukon River. - S.K.) ... Before the sale of *Russian* possessions in America to the United States, there was a Russian settlement on this place - Mikhailovsky redoubt. It was founded in 1833 by the lieutenant of the Russian fleet Mikhail Tebenkov (Wrangel was the main ruler then. - S.K.). It was the northernmost settlement of Russian America. From here, in the 40s of the last century, lieutenant Lavrenty Zagoskin began his wonderful trip deep into Alaska to the great Kvihpak (Yukon) and Kuskokwim rivers ...

A lot of work was once given by the Russian people to the development of Alaska - a distant overseas outskirts of their state. They brought here unprecedented garden crops, taught the indigenous people to breed

livestock, marked the beginning of exploration and mining. They created here not only shipyards, which first built sailing, and then iron steam ships, but also schools in which the children of the Aleuts, Eskimos and Indians studied. Half a century has passed, but the memory of Russian America, despite the efforts of the Americans, has been preserved among Alaskan residents.

Having bought Alaska for next to nothing, the Americans set about plundering its riches on a grand scale. Least of all they were interested in the conditions of existence of the indigenous inhabitants of this country. Then, streams of gold diggers poured into Alaska and the life of a person, especially an Indian or an Eskimo, began to be valued there cheaper than a revolver bullet.

The new owners named the Mikhailovsky redoubt San-Maikel. Steamships wintered here.
on the Yukon River...

At that time, the settlement consisted of 300-400 inhabitants and 120-140 people of the local garrison. San Maikel had a school, two small hospitals (one of them for the military), a Catholic church and an Orthodox church. The plot of land on which the temple was located, and after the sale of Alaska to the United States, was considered Russian territory. This was the case in general with all the Orthodox churches in Alaska. Orthodoxy was widespread among the Eskimos and Aleuts of Alaska. The Orthodox Church in America was united into the "Aleutian Diocese"...

The stay in San Michel lasted 10 days ... Before the ships left, we were presented with one of the old cast-iron cannons that once constituted the armament of the Russian Mikhailovsky redoubt.

And here is the evidence of American Alaska and the same San Michael of the eighties of the XX century, owned by the English traveler Ranulph Fiennes, who made the first round-the-world trip not "along" the Earth, that is, in the latitudinal direction, but "across", that is, along the meridian, through both poles of the earth...

Fiennes was in Alaska in 1980, and this is what he wrote: "St. Michael seemed to us a sunny, wind-pierced place. It stood on a peat bog and consisted of randomly scattered wooden houses, interconnected by wooden footbridges. Once it was a lively Russian settlement. In fact, most of the Eskimos had Russian names (in 1980! - S.K.). But then the capitalist tsars sold Alaska to the Americans, and now the settlement looked like a ghost town."

Do I need to add something here and comment?

Alas, we must...

This report by Fiennes in the Russian edition of 1992 was accompanied by the following editorial comment: "In 1867, Alexander II ceded Alaska for 7.2 million dollars. But there were reasons for this geopolitical (wow! - S.K.) plan - it is better to cede Alaska to the friendly United States (yes, since 1992 they have become a new Russia much more "friendly" - S.K.) than to lose (? - S.K.). Russia at that time, after the most difficult Crimean War, in the words of Prince Gorchakov, "concentrated", gathering forces. I had to save money, cut off the superfluous and vulnerable, look for allies, gradually breaking the situation that had developed after the Crimean War ... "

This was written in 1992, when the ideological heirs of the unsuccessful Alexander began to "save" and cut off from Russia the "extra" Moldavia-Bessarabia, Ukraine and Belarus, the Baltic states and the Caucasus, Transcaucasia and Central Asia ...

Eh!

How did they not even reach Primorye then? After all, in the early 20s of the XX century there was a "buffer"

The Far Eastern Republic, the Far Eastern Republic (it will be mentioned in its place) ...

CEREMONY of transfer of possessions and lowering of the Russian flag on the main square of Baranovsky Novo Arkhangelsk took place on October 6 (18), 1867.

But even before that, the former Russian America began to be sold and put into circulation by land and other speculators. The very possessions that Marx, referring to the documents of the congress, considered to be not worth a cent economically, were sold under the hammer even before they became American officially!

The commander of the Minin armored frigate under construction (it was built, by the way, for a record long time - 12 years), captain 2nd rank Alexei Alekseevich Peshchurov, was appointed government commissioner for the transfer from Russia, from the US side - General L.Kh. Rousseau. For what merits the latter was appointed commissar, I do not know, but I suppose that for his surname - in an additional mockery of Russians...

The last chief ruler of the RAK colonies was the captain of the 1st rank, Prince D.P. Maksutov - prince as prince. Nothing bad can be said about him, but he also played an unenviable role.

As for Peshchurov, the note about him that Reiter sent to Alexander was dated June 13, 1867 (and Stekl and Seward exchanged instructions given to their commissars on August 13 - whether by chance or for secret symbolism, I don't know). On July 12, Peshchurov was already in Washington.

On August 31, Russo and Peshchurov moved to California through Panama, arrived there on September 22 and reached Novo-Arkhangelsk on the warship "Ossipi" at 11 am on October 6 (18), Friday.

The journey was long, but what the commissars came here for took less than one day! The flag was lowered and the flag was raised right on the day of arrival - at 15:30. General Rousseau did not even want to catch his breath a little from seasickness, which he suffered severely. This is to the stories that the Yankees bought Russian America "reluctantly" ...

A week earlier, the steamer John L. Stephens had come to Sitka, carrying General J. Davis and 250 soldiers.

October 14 (26) Peshchurov and Russo signed the official protocol. According to list "A" of this protocol, fortifications and public buildings were transferred to the US commissioner, including the house of the main ruler, shipyards, warehouses, barracks, batteries, a hospital and a school, as well as the entire RAC colonial archive.

Of the 500 Russians on Sitka, 15 people expressed a desire to join freedom and took an oath to American allegiance. Total - 3 percent ... Well - a normal "new Russian" percentage.

General Russo behaved correctly - such was his role - "a good guy."

General Davis... General Davis acted like General Davis...

A day after signing the protocol, he showed these Russian sheep who are here now. shepherd! And on October 17 (29) Peshchurov wrote to Stekl:

And after another half a month, the news from Peshchurov acquired even greater "tastiness":

And the Russian colonists, virtually abandoned to the mercy of Davis, hit the mass - who smog - escape ...

They tried to tear the nose of the Tlingits. One of their leaders declared: "True, we allowed the Russians own the island. But we don't intend to give it to anyone and everyone we meet."

Well, General Davis brought both him and his tribe to reason quickly, as only Yankee generals in

conditions of absolute cannon superiority!

On the former Russian lands, there were times not only of arbitrariness, but also of desolation. They used to be here masters, and now predators, jackals have come ...

The SKETCH of the "eagle" flag of the RAC was approved on September 28, 1806 directly by Alexander The first to write "Be Therefore"!

In the upper left quarter of the flag, which repeated the then national colors, impetuously opened wings characteristic "Alexandrovsky" eagle ... It meant a lot and obligated to a lot.

Yes, it was conceived and started promisingly ... And with intelligence, and with prowess, and with a perspective ...

It ended...

* * *

AMAZING... The territory of Russian America was not disputed. One could still agree with the claims of Spain, Mexico and the United States on Fort Ross, and even then ...

First, one of the significant reasons that prompted Ispa

Our reason for moving up north along the California coast was our founding of Fort Ross. This has already been discussed.

Secondly, even then there were not so few precedents for the presence of tiny colonies of other powers on the territory of vast states.

In full view of all of Europe, the British Rock of Gibraltar proudly stuck out on the nose of the same Spain (it still sticks out there, and is still British) ... Why is there not a precedent in the dispute over Fort Ross? Not to mention all of Russian America!

So there was no dispute...

And what about the coastal "point" Portuguese colonies of Diu and Daman, which controlled the Gulf of Cambay in the west of British India? They were Portuguese for more than a dozen years and within the already independent India! And what about the Portuguese colony of Goa in Middle Hindustan? And English Hong Kong in China? What about the French Kerguelen Archipelago in the southern Indian Ocean? What about the English Falkland Islands?

Indeed, from any point of view, and above all - from the point of view of the naturalness of possession, France and England has immeasurably less rights to Kerguelen and the Falklands than Russia has to Alaska and the Aleuts!

Yes, Fort Ross...

As for Russian America itself, it was **legally** Russian territory. If if it were otherwise, the United States would simply absorb it, and that's it. Without any contracts!

And they negotiated and in the end signed such an agreement with Russia, from the text of which it clearly followed that the United States is fully aware of Russia's legitimate and inalienable rights to the overseas possessions.

Otherwise, the United States could get these lands only by war. How do they end up received the war from Mexico Upper California.

But war is war ... Our territory could not be threatened by the United States, but Russia, in the case military operations could spoil the life of the Yankees ...

Let's say, although we bought ships from them, we ourselves also knew how to build them! Two years after the surrender of our American possessions, on May 24, 1869, the world's first parapet-tower battleship Kreyser was laid down at the shipyard of Galerny Island in St. Petersburg, on the eve of launching in the summer of 1872, renamed Peter the Great.

Displacement 10105 tons, length 100.6 meters, width 19.3 meters, draft - 7. Two steam engines of 4452 horsepower each, 6 boilers, speed 14.26 knots, cruising range up to 3600 miles (6670 km). Side armor 203–356 mm, deck armor 76 mm. Armament: four 305 mm guns in two rotating turrets with 356 mm turret armor, four 87 mm guns on side barbettes, six 47 mm guns and four 37 mm guns, two underwater torpedo tubes. Crew 440 people.

According to its tactical and technical data, "Peter the Great" was considered the strongest warship of its time and was in the fleet for thirty years! Since 1923, it was used as a blockship (floating warehouse) and was dismantled for metal in 1959 - ninety years after the laying.

The author of the project was Admiral Andrey Alexandrovich Popov, the main builders were ship engineers M.M. Okunev and A.E. Leontiev. All, as you can see, Russians ...

Do not spend Russia soon funds to protect the "brothers" from the Turks, but then build heels of such battleships under the coal of Russian America, and it would be possible ...

Oh, a lot of things could have been done to us then, and little then the Yankees could have done in the Pacific!

Moreover, in the fact that we own Russian America quite legally, according to all standards international law, no one doubted. I had no doubts before its sale, and after ...

Here is the Grave Notes, a memoir by Viscount François René de Chateaubriand, little known to us, first published in 1849-1850. The author of the memoirs is by no means indifferent to the problem of priorities. Say, stating at the end of his life that, since he "saw the sky from the cradle", the whole geography of the world has changed, Chateaubriand further writes: "French navigators once

recently looked in the ice of the Antarctic Pole the sixth continent ... "

We know that almost twenty years before the French expedition of 1837-1840 under the leadership of Dumont-Durville, this continent was "seen" by the Russian expedition of Bellingshausen and Lazarev. But the melancholic viscount does not see this priority point-blank.

However, regarding Russian priorities in America, Chateaubriand is quite unambiguous ... The 11th section of book 7 of his "Notes", referring to April - September 1822, he begins like this: "Speaking of Canada and Louisiana, looking at old maps and seeing vast lands , *once belonging to the French, I could not understand how the government of my country could leave these colonies to the mercy of fate, which today would become for us an inexhaustible source of wealth ...*

Residents of a territory bounded in the northeast by the Atlantic Ocean, in the north by the Polar Sea, in the northwest by the Pacific Ocean and Russian possessions (emphasis mine. - S.K.), *in the south by the Gulf of Mexico - and this is more than two-thirds of North America - would recognize the French laws...*"

As for the first part of these lamentations, if Canada and Louisiana were replaced by Alaska and the Aleutians, they would be quite suitable for a Russian writer after the sale of Russian America.

As for the second part, the reader sees that Chateaubriand is talking about Russian possessions in the North America as a trivial and indisputable fact...

And here is another French assessment on our topic ...

In 1875 - eight years after the sale of Alaska - the final part of Jules Verne's well-known oceanic trilogy "The Mysterious Island" was published ... The action there was attributed to the time of the Civil War of the North and South in the USA - to 1865.

Engineer Cyrus Smith, an American (!), demonstrates there an ingenious way of winter hunting for predatory animals and explains: "I did not invent this thing - it is used by Aleut hunters in that part of America, which belongs to the Russians..."

Double confirmation of our undoubted right to a part of America - a literary hero an American and its creator - a French writer!

What about adventure novels? Take the history of the Anglo-American Oregon Treaty of 1846. On July 12, 1845, Secretary of State Buchanan, in a note to the English envoy Pakenham, stated that, that is, exactly to the borders of claim all of Oregon down to 54°40', Russian America. And no further. The British balked, and in the end, the border was drawn at 49°, excluding Vancouver Island (as it is to this day).

So we were within our rights! And why did we have to give it up?

Fars with the sale-purchase of Russian America finally ended ...

But is it possible, however, to say that it has ended if **the Yankees even today, in the 21st century, claim the Russian Wrangel Island, located in the Arctic Ocean almost a thousand kilometers west of the Bering Strait, on the basis of "the provisions of the 1867 treaty of the year"?**

Of course, there is nothing of the kind in this "agreement", but what impudence, greed and arrogance! Almost a century and a half has passed, and they are even itchy with Wrangel Island!

Look, reader, at the geographical map, find this island, and...

And I don't know about you, but when I look at the map, at the position of this island, at the Aleut ridge, which, if it remained Russian, could make the Bering Strait for Russia something like the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles for Turkey - in the chest a deaf, evil, unaccountable hatred is born ...

And the hand involuntarily reaches for the trigger of the missing, alas, automatic machine at hand Kalashnikov...

And I, an aerospace engineer by education and a weapons engineer by profession, myself education and profession

tanned in respect for the scientific and technological achievements of America, I begin to hate her!

I appreciate the spirit of the American dream not about a cottage smelling of synthetic fumes, but about a free individual...

To this day I read London and Dreiser, Twain and O'Henry, Zelazny and Asimov, Rex Stout and Longfellow, Murphy's laws and the prose of Rockwell Kent...

I admire the tenacity of the American farmer and the organizational genius of Henry Ford...

And I hate America...

And am I to blame?

And would those whom I listed above not hate (and hated!) **This** "America" themselves?

However, we will still have time to talk about Wrangel Island in a special chapter 12 about it ... In the meantime

let's go back to the summer of 1868, to Washington...

The treaty between Russia and the United States was signed on March 30, 1867.

Ratified by the Senate April 10, 1867.

Ratified by the Russian Emperor on May 16, 1867.

The transfer protocol was signed on October 14, 1867.

But even by July 1868, Russia had not received a single cent and not a single penny from the United States for all this.

Didn't get it because the allocation of funds has not yet been authorized by the House of Representatives.

In fact, this fact alone calls into question the legitimacy of this whole story to this day! Article VI of the agreement dated March 18 (30), 1867 began as follows:

And Article VII read:

We consider ... Three months from the beginning of April for ratification and exchange of ratifications, plus ten months to pay. Total - thirteen (again, damn them, it's thirteen!) months ...

We bend on the fingers: April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November, December 1867 and January, February, March, April 1868. That's it - a damn dozen months have passed.

But even in July, I repeat, nothing has been paid to us yet. Actually, since May 1868, the contract turned out to be invalid due to non-fulfillment of its conditions by the United States itself!

In the text of the treaty, by the way, there was also a discrepancy between Article IV and the already well-known us Article VI.

In Article IV, the last sentence was:

"But an assignment with the right of immediate possession must nevertheless be considered full and unconditional from the time of the exchange of ratifications, without waiting for the formal transfer thereof."

That is, we give you our part of America in three months, and you give us money - only after ten. Baron Stekl clearly did not read Ilf and Petrov's *The Twelve Chairs* and was not familiar with the wise principle of fitter Mechnikov: "Money ahead! In the morning - money, in the evening - chairs, or in the evening - money, and in the morning - chairs"...

This discrepancy was noticed even by academician Bolkhovitinov, who is usually loyal to the generous Yankee grants. But the strangest thing is that it was noticed - according to Stekl - by Stekl himself in real time and told Seward about it.

The strange thing is that if Stekl himself wrote this treaty, he could have inconsistencies and avoid.

But *for some reason*, he allowed it.

But—according to Stekl—Seward assured him that there could be no inconvenience in this, that a delay in the payment of money was inevitable due to a break in the meetings of Congress, but "honor (n-yes! - S.K.) United States is bound by this agreement."

"He assured me," Stekl wrote to Gorchakov on April 7, 1867, *"that on the same day when Congress will meet, it will allocate the necessary funds and put them at our disposal."*

This conversation took place on the night of the signing of the treaty, when the Congress was already dissolved. And, as the reader will hopefully remember, in order to ratify the treaty, President Johnson had to call an emergency session of the Senate. The House of Representatives was supposed to meet in December, after eight

extra months.

Eight months - not ten, but oh well ... However, not like on the "same day" when the Congress I was going to, but six months after that, the issue of paying money to Russia was in question!

As I understand it, my dear reader, this can only happen in "the freest country in the world"! The supreme power has already concluded an international agreement, it has been ratified by both parties, General Davis has already managed to expel all the Russians from Russian America, and congressmen still need to be persuaded to agree to pay what should have been paid a long time ago, if only because this obligation - as there? "The honor of the United States is bound."

The States have kept their honor! When Stoeckl suggested to U.S. Treasury Secretary Hugh McCulloch in April 1867 that the money be paid in London through the Bering brothers, the Yankees stated:

"I am obligated to honor the terms of the contract and pay the money at the Treasury in Washington.

Yes, the Yankees blew their honor! On the other hand, they didn't put our honor in a cent, and how could it be otherwise, if on dignity Petersburg did not give a damn about her!

Only on July 14, 1868, the House of Representatives deigned to make a decision on payment.

113 congressmen were in favor, 43 were against, and 44 members of the House did not vote.

The Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Banks, gleefully reported to Seward:

"Of the 44 who did not vote, 28 would vote in favor, 7 are considered doubtful, but most likely would vote positively, and 11 would vote negatively; as a result, the final vote would be 151 votes for the bill and 50 against.

Whatever you think, the conclusion is the same - according to arithmetic, the congressman at school had a unit. But the point is clear...

Banks then boasted to his wife Mary:

"All my friends congratulate me on a brilliant vote...we basically got 150 votes out of 201. Everyone feels satisfied ... The Secretary of State is delighted ... "

And what was there to be happy about? I would like to look at all these Banks, Sumners, Johnsons, Swards, Glasses, Gorchakovs, Crabbe Reuters and Konstantin and Alexander, if the congressmen did not agree to the payment on July 14 ...

But they deigned to agree, and on August 1, 1868, Stekl finally received a warrant for the agreed amount.

So, by the way, I'll note that interest on seven-odd million dollars in gold coins is due to us from May to August 1868. And since they were not paid, then the interest on these unpaid interest should have flowed to us to this day!

By the way, in our time, Stanford University law professor Tom Campbell calculated that the amount from April 20 (this is the legal deadline) 1868 to August 1 was \$ 108,493 ... It is from this amount that we need to calculate the interest for the current XXI century ...

Although what is there - the contract of 1867 in 1868 was in fact canceled by the Yankees themselves!

CHANCELLOR Gorchakov after the Crimean War declared that Russia was "concentrating" (in fact, he said "La Russie ne boude pas, elle se recueille" - "Russia is not pouting, she is gathering her strength", but the better-known translation is "concentrating").

Ten years after the Alaskan disgrace, she "focused" and got involved in a war with Turkey,

absolutely unnecessary for Russia.

We did not acquire anything in the Balkans and could not acquire it. Caucasian increments of that time we could get and got through the fighting directly in the Caucasus.

On the other hand, we put up to two hundred thousand Russian soldiers in the Balkans.

For what?

And how much Russian sweat, blood and...

And - money.

If only with such scope and perseverance the tsars would hold on to Russian America! They would not have had prices then, monuments made of pure gold (Alaskan) they would have had to put up then.

And so...

What did the average Soviet schoolboy know about Alexander II? Well, the king was not good, the Narodnaya Volya executed him, but he freed the peasants, although without land.

But even kindergarteners in Russia should know: huh, Alexander II? Yes, this is the one who our Alaska sold?

Although he sold not only Alaska.

The Aleutian Islands were also given up - our potential forward oceanic redoubt and base for development in the Pacific Ocean of any policy that is beneficial and necessary for us.

And what about the Pribylov Islands, far from the coast of America, with their seal rookeries?

And the lonely island of St. Matthew?

And - I will not tire of reminding - the island of St. Lawrence, almost buried in Chukotka.

What, and the island of St. Lawrence did not have the strength to hold? What, without him the deal would not have taken place? Why did America need him?

John Quincy Adams stated that "just as an apple can only fall on the ground, so Cuba can only gravitate towards the mother's womb, towards the North American continent."

And to which continent does the island of St. Lawrence gravitate?

Yes, kindergarteners in Russia should know this ...

But what kindergartners are there! Quite adult uncles from the Lube group cheerfully declare: fool America! Give back the land of Alyasochka..."

Well, the song is not bad, and these words are good ...

But what about the Aleuts?

With the archipelago of Alexander, which was named after Alexander the First and which Alexander
The second one passed?

And what about Laurentia Island?

It's also bad that Viktor Rastorguev states: "Ekaterina, you were wrong!"

But Rastorguev himself is wrong here.

And you and I, my dear reader, now know well why.

What about money? What are the pieces of paper if they are not provided with the dignity and property of the State? But

even - that there is gold in the ground!

Every year, the Pribylov Islands, where the world's largest rookeries of seals.

But there were also beavers, and arctic foxes, and sables ...

Only from 1791 to 1821 (in fact, this is the era of Baranov and Buldakov), one fur worth 16 million 377 thousand rubles was exported from the colonies to Russia. At the same time, the 1st TSB inaccurately indicates the figure of 16 million in total profit for the entire period of RAC activity - net profit!

And for Alaska, the king received only eleven million, and even then not immediately, with a creak.

The UNITED STATES bought Alaska (however, they rather bought *it*) obviously for the future. A little less than thirty years after the sale, at the end of the 19th century, "Brockhaus and Efron" in the article "Alaska" reported:

And then followed the amazing and thought-provoking things:

Everything is right! In 1868, the US Congress included "Alaska" (as the entire new acquisition was called, along with the islands) in the fiscal system and, in fact, did not create a civil administration apparatus for the "Alaska" district, confining itself to a customs duty collector in Sitka (the former Novo- Arkhangelsk). Small garrisons in southeastern Alaska were intended to suppress the indigenous population. In 1877 they were withdrawn from there altogether. The Indian problem was solved in rough outline, the times of the Chingachgooks are gone forever ...

The power of the Yankees was represented in Alaska by stationary ships of the Navy. Only the organic act of 1884 turned Alaska into a "civil district" with the beginnings of civil administration, which was caused by the influx of gold prospectors here. The indigenous population, dying from diseases, was given under the care of the missionaries.

It turned out that the "union government" needed Alaska, as ...

Yes, he didn't need her, it turns out! No way!

So everything I wrote above is wrong?

Don't think...

After all, the Yankees nevertheless chopped off Russian America for some reason from Russia, which for seventy years of its success mastered, developed and managed it no less successfully, not finding management superfluous and expensive.

And the Yankees knew why they did it!

The purchase of Russian America was beneficial to them in general and directly economically. Thus, the richest fur seal rookeries on the Pribylov Islands were declared a national reservation in 1869, and since 1870 it was transferred to the monopoly lease of the Alaska Trading Company with numerous subsidiaries (ATK rented our Commanders, preyed on Kamchatka, etc.).

But the direct beneficiaries here were more likely to be US citizens than the US government.

The US government, on the other hand, made this purchase "for growth", as a reserve - primarily geopolitical. However, Alaska to this day remains for the United States and one of the strategic resource reserves.

Brockhaus and Efron ended his article as follows: "Alaska will become important for the United States only when they eventually acquire English possessions in the northwest, lying between Alaska and Washington territory." By "Washington Territory" here was meant the territory of the state of Washington, bordering Canadian British Columbia.

The authors of the Brockhaus article were so slavishly confident in Uncle Sam's omnipotence that they didn't even doubted that England would cede to the States a certain coastal "Vancouver", so to speak, "corridor" ...

But America has never seriously stuttered on this score. And for what? Despite the fact that even now the "territory of Alaska" (which became a state only in 1959) has not received much development, even then, at the end of the 19th century, it was of paramount importance for the United States.

And this meaning was that - as I have said more than once - **Alaska was no longer Russian.**

And this provided the widest opportunities for any US Pacific adventures and provocations against Russia in the coming 20th century.

In 1910, Vladimir Ivanovich Vernadsky in his work "Experience in Descriptive Mineralogy" noted: "It is curious that shortly before the sale of Alaska to the North American States, some Russian researchers (Doroshin) pointed out the reliability of its gold placers (K. Bogdanovich, I, p. 38) . This was "forgotten" during the sale. The Yukon was first explored by the Russians (by Lukin and others—see Bogdanovich, I, p. 47). The sale of Alaska is waiting for its researcher and is one of the sad pages of Russian stories".

In August 1913, Vladimir Ivanovich participated in the XII International Geological Congress, visiting the USA and Canada. In one of his letters to Alexander Evgenievich Fersman, he wrote: "I am *amazed at the abundance of Canadians and Americans of Russian origin, mainly workers.* (these were already emigrants of the late XIX - early XX century. - S.K.). *It is here on the spot that you feel what a huge power Russia has lost and is losing in this emigration, and it is going to the growth of the New World, which is in many ways unfriendly to us. I cannot forget here about the mistake (and crime?) that the governments of Nicholas I and Alexander II made when they gave away Russian America, obtained through the efforts of the people.*

Around the same time, in 1915, Vernadsky's colleague, the famous Russian scientist Vladimir Afanasyevich Obruchev, published the first edition of his science fiction novel Plutonia, in which there is a passage that refers not to fantasy, but to bitter reality. Here it is:

"Late in the evening, when the sun, which had not yet set, rolled like a red ball on the northern horizon, The Polar Star left the Bering Strait for the Arctic Ocean...

... When the shores of Alaska began to disappear on the horizon, Maksheev, who was standing along with the others passengers at the side, exclaimed:

— Farewell, former Russian land, a jewel donated to the Americans.

— How so? Borovoy was surprised. - As far as I remember, our government sold to the United States this sad country.

— Yes, sold for seven million dollars. Do you know how much the Yankees have already made from this sad country?

- Well, the same or maybe twice!

- You are sorely mistaken! One gold they took out of Alaska for two hundred million dollars. And in addition to gold, which has not yet been completely exhausted, there is silver, copper, tin and coal, which are being mined. Then furs, big forests across the Yukon. They are building a railroad. Walking the Yukon steamships.

Well, we have nothing to be sorry about! Trukhanov noted. "Alaska would have remained in the same primeval state as the Chukchi land, where there is also gold and coal. And furs, but there is no sense in all this.

- For the time being, - objected Kashtanov, - the free development of Russia is generally crushed

autocracy. But the government will change, and we, perhaps, will begin to work on a large scale, and then Alaska would be very useful to us. Owning it and the Chukotka land, we would command the entire north of the Pacific Ocean, and not a single American predator would dare to poke its nose here; and now they feel like masters in the Bering Strait and the Arctic Ocean.

- And even in the Chukchi land! Makshe added bitterly

ev. "They supply the Chukchi with goods and exchange furs, walrus ivory for alcohol, skins..." That's it.

The END of the reign of Emperor Alexander II came on March 1, 1881. On that day, the tsar drove along Malaya Sadovaya to the Mikhailovsky Manege, then to the Mikhailovsky Palace, and along Inzhenernaya Street his carriage drove to the embankment of the Catherine Canal. It was three o'clock in the afternoon.

Throwers of Narodnaya Volya have already been placed along its probable route - Ignatius Grinevitsky, Nikolay Rysakov, Timofey Mikhailov...

Mikhail Frolenko, at the signal of Anna Yakimova, was ready to blow up a mine in a tunnel.

And here is the carriage on the embankment.

Rysakov throws the first bomb.

The carriage is damaged, the king is unharmed. He goes out onto the pavement to approach the captured Rysakov. The king had self-control - no doubt. Yes, and personal courage - in contrast to the courage of the state - was enough ...

But here Grinevitsky throws a second bomb between the tsar and himself.

Oh, it's a pity not to get to the embankment of the Catherine's Canal on March 1, 1881 without a non-existent time machine! And if it were possible, and if Grinevitsky had turned out to be as unfortunate as Rysakov, then I would probably have thrown a third bomb at the emperor myself.

For the sold Russian America...

And for Russia sold to the Rothschilds - too!

Chapter 11

A little about historians and geopolitics...

NOW I want to talk a little, if not about kings and cabbage, then about historians and geopolitics... However, I have to say something about "cabbage", but "cabbage" is in quotation marks and, as they say now, "bucks". Today, many are very eager for her ... And some historians, including.

And first, a small digression. And not lyrical, but, I confess, evil ...

In 2001, a two-volume work by Vladimir Krutov and Shvetsova-Krutova about the Decembrists, White Spots of Red, was published in Moscow. This study claims to be some kind of discovery, for it shows the Decembrists in color rather than red, but black and even dirty. In my opinion, this is a caricature, but in any caricature there is some resemblance to reality.

There is an unhappy truth in the aforementioned family work. But a lot of it is malicious, cool distorted and sewn with dirty, I repeat, threads ...

Here is how, for example, the Krutovs report about a certain moment familiar to us - about the secret decision of Alexander the First to bequeath the throne to his younger brother Nikolai, bypassing Konstantin: "The secret of the will (although it was not a will, but a decree of August 16, 1823. - S. K.) *Alexander I was unprecedented!!!*.

The well-known researcher Natan Eidelman wrote: "The strictest secrecy is observed: Arakcheev, on behalf of the tsar, asked the Moscow Metropolitan Filaret how he was going to bring the envelope to the Assumption Cathedral. He explained that during

the divine service, he will enter the altar (this will not arouse suspicion in anyone) and hide the envelope in the ark (actually, this ark, although it was in the Assumption Cathedral, was not a holy ark, but an ark of state acts, and secretly sneaking to it needs was not - S.K.).

Arakcheev stressed that the Sovereign Emperor is not pleased with the slightest publicity.

And then the Krutovs comment: *"Here is the plot: Arakcheev, a friend-official, one of the closest to the emperor, fussed about confidentiality, not knowing the contents of the document. And the metropolitan, hiding the envelope in the folds of church attire, looking around, secretly, put the most important state document for storage in the altar in the ark! Amazing country..."*

This is such a cool quote...

No, I'm not even going to ask: why do you need to look around in the altar, if you're there alone? And if not one then how can you not arouse suspicion by looking around?

I will not be persistent in my desire to find out from the "roots" - how did the St. Petersburg officials get out, wrapped in tight uniforms without folds, "smuggling" packets with copies of the secret decree of the tsar to the Senate, the Holy Synod and the State Council?

I will simply quote the august biographer of Tsar Alexander, Grand Duke Nikolai Mikhailovich, who is familiar to the reader: "It seems to me that wherever Nikolai Pavlovich knew about the abdication (in his favor. - S.K.), this is a matter of secondary importance; but the fact is unconditional that he was aware of this, as well as Filaret, Prince A.N. Golitsyn, Count Arakcheev, as well as both empresses.

We repeat, we do not see anything "strange" in the setting of this whole affair, and as for the impression of mystery, it is rather understandable in view of the importance of the act itself. Petersburg, the manifesto was kept in

three main state institutions: in the State Council, the Holy Synod and the Senate. What more?

I don't know about the reader, but I trust Nikolai's grandson and Alexander's great-grandson more than Nathan Eidelman and Vladimir Krutov.

I hope the reader does too.

However, in order to have objective grounds for such distrust, I had to, having dealt with a mountain of sources, write this book (and read it for the reader). And now you can't take us so easily "on the gun" ... However, how many of their fellow citizens have such Eidelmans and Krutovs twisted their brains into a ram's horn?

And how many more will they spin ... And if everything was limited to "researchers" Eidelman and Krutov!

HOWEVER, it's time to go directly to the topic ...

Regarding Russian America, there are many excellent Russian historians and historical thinkers erred in good faith.

So, for example, such a deeply respected geopolitician as Nikolai Yakovlevich Danilevsky, in his classic work "Russia and Europe", lamented: "Settlement by jumps across the seas or significant intervals does not work out, even if they are patronized by the government. We failed American colony, something fails and Cupid ... "

The question is why did we "fail" in Russian America and why even Amur fails? - Danilevsky did not seriously ask himself ... And one of the reasons was that he could not directly blame tsarism for this. And not everyone was deep Nikolai Yakovlevich. And I didn't know everything...

Although what there is special to know in order to ask the question: "How is it so? Before Baikal and Okhotsk, the Russians succeeded in settling without any problems, but in Russian America and the Amur it was so choking ... Why?

And the answer is obvious - because Baikal and Okhotsk lay quite far from the Russian natural borders. But Alaska and the middle Amur with the Ussuri were frontiers in themselves, and the boundary conditions are rarely simple - even in mathematics, even in life.

Plus, I repeat, the increasingly decaying tsarism (to call it autocracy with huge external debts of Russia by the seventies of the XIX century, my tongue does not turn).

Plus - "the confidants of debauchery", standing in a greedy crowd at the throne, and we will touch.

However, to assess tsarism as one of the main obstacles to the free development of Russia during the of tsarism, not all were solved.

You can't call Danilevsky's term "jump" deep and accurate either ... In the cold northern latitudes, there is no you really jump even in the summer, and the Russians didn't "jump" there, but gradually and consistently **went to East!**

Toward the sun...

This two-century trip to the eastern ocean was deeply natural and historically justified.

At first - to the "wild shore of the Irtysh", then - beyond the Ob, beyond the Lena, beyond the Kolyma ... The Pacific Ocean became just another - albeit the most significant, great water barrier on the Russians' path to the Sun and to that line beyond which it was further to go it is no longer possible - someone else began there ...

Actually, even in Alaska, Russian people did not firmly go beyond the Yukon and Tanana basins. By line, the Russian-English border was drawn to the east already in the parquet halls ...

Well, okay, few people succeed in real-time geopolitical analysis.

But what prevents deep and comprehensive analysis today?

I once mentioned the collective monograph by former Soviet historians (now they call themselves Russian historians) "The History of Russia's Foreign Policy. The first half of the 19th century (From the wars of Russia against Napoleon to the Peace of Paris in 1856) by the International Relations publishing house (1995).

Already at the beginning of the section devoted to relations between Russia and the United States, an amazing statement: *"The interests of the two countries did not directly collide on the world stage" ...*

It seems that for a whole team of doctors of historical sciences, if something happened outside the wars with Napoleon or not in Paris, then this is no longer a world stage, but just backyards. Just think - some kind of Russian America, some kind of complaints from some kind of Russian American company ...

The heroes of Obruchev's "Plutonia" and the author of this extraordinary novel himself thought differently.

As for the very academic story about Russian America in the monograph, almost everything is mentioned there on a dozen pages - both the Decree of September 4, and subsequent conventions ... And even that RAC note that Ryleev signed among others is also not forgotten (like Ryleev) ... However, the picture at the same time drawn so idyllic that the Yankees look, well, just the best friends of the Russian people and oh-oh-oh, oh-oh-oh, kindred spirits...

Even the burning of the American capital-"village" by the British in 1814 is compared by Russian historians with ... the fire of Moscow in 1812! Like, we have similar historical destinies.

N-yes!

The Monroe Doctrine is not forgotten by the authors, and the meaning is given to it "progressive" on that on the grounds that it strengthened the national security of the United States.

That's right, but what about Russia's national security?

Oh, everyone is "okay!", the doctors of science assure: *"The fact that the Monroe Doctrine appeared as if in response to the Decree of Alexander I of 1821 does not mean at all that it was directed mainly against Russia, as claimed in the past, some authors..."*

But they immediately blurt out: *"At present, it is considered proven that the royal decree served as an occasion rather than a reason for the proclamation of the Monroe Doctrine ... "*

However, thank you for that - after all, there are doctors and academics who deny at least some mutual connection between the Monroe Doctrine and Russia's intentions to protect **its** national security, explaining everything by the US concern for the freedom of Latin American "brothers".

About the Convention-surrender in pathetic tones, it is reported that on April 5 (17), 1824, *"the first agreement in the history of relations between the two countries was concluded"* ... And not a word about the fact that it would be better to have no agreements at all than to have one. Moreover, it was said that "the parties went to mutual concessions."

Yes! Still, by concluding the Convention with us, the Yankees made a considerable concession - they gave in advance an impossible promise to rob us for no more than 10 years.

However, the "Russian-American" section of the doctor's monograph was only edited, and he wrote it only a candidate of sciences, and, perhaps, therefore, elements of truth are observed in him.

Here, let's say, the same Monroe Doctrine ... Almost unanimously, almost all Russian, Soviet and Russian historians kept repeating and repeating that this doctrine proclaimed the principle "America for Americans", referring to the Yankees in South America ...

And yet, even in many academic sources there is not a word about paragraph No. 7 of the annual message of the President of the United States to Congress of December 2, 1823. But in the section written by the candidate of sciences, he is mentioned, albeit in one sentence.

Well, and for this grain of truth, too - thank you. After all, without knowing about this paragraph, we are simply not able to correctly evaluate the Monroe Doctrine, which is only part of the above presidential message.

So paragraph seven...

With THIS far from magnificent "seven", any little a little honest Russian historian.

Nevertheless, I found a detailed explanation of the essence of the matter only in petite note No. 136 on page 719 of volume XIII of the multi-volume collection of documents "Foreign Policy of Russia in the 19th and early 20th centuries", published in 1982 by the Nauka publishing house with a circulation of 10,600 copies.

And this note in the smallest type says: *"The foreign policy principles formulated in paragraphs 7, 48 and 49 of the message are known as the Monroe Doctrines. Relations with Russia, in particular the issue of delimitation in the American Northwest, were dealt with by the first part of the doctrine (paragraph 7), where the "principle of non-colonization" was formulated, which stated that "the American continents, in view of the free and independent position that they have achieved and which they preserved, should not be considered henceforth as an object of colonization by any European power."*

It turns out that the principle of "non-colonization" was included in the "Russian" paragraph of the message! But this is the most important thing! And the tsarist decree on Russian America was not the reason here, but one of the reasons that the Yankees began to show their teeth to Russia - then still at the doctrinal, conceptual level, and not at the level of actions.

And only in the second part of the doctrine (paragraphs 48, 49), as the same footnote No. 136 informs us, the position of the USA was stated in relation to the former Spanish colonies in America. (I will note in brackets that the largest colony in South America was not the Spanish, but the Portuguese colony of Brazil, but by that time Portugal was not so quoted in the world that Monroe did not consider it necessary to waste time and vocal cords on threats against her, at that time as for Spain, taking into account the US calculations for California and the future "independent greatness" of the "banana republics", it was necessary to actively press.)

So, only in a petite footnote of a small-circulation and purely special edition could a Soviet person become aware of the true content (and true direction) of the fundamental American expansionist doctrine and see how sinister and impudent it was. relation to Russia!

But even historians themselves do not always look into the notes. But in the preface to **the same** volume it is reported in black and white: *"The documents show Russia's attitude towards the Monroe Doctrine and indicate that the issue of delimiting the possessions of Russia and the United States in North America was not of significant importance in the development of the doctrine and its proclamation; she was aiming*

ensure the freedom of US expansion on the American continent without hindrance from the European powers."

Well, is it possible to comment on this within the framework of the normative vocabulary?

Hardly...

And that's the only reason I won't comment on them, but I'll ask

the authors of this amazing statement: "And what - Russia is not a European power? And Alaska and Fort Ross, what - are not on the American continent? And, finally, did you forget paragraph 7 of the message to Congress and note 136 in your own edition?"

By the way, some of those who edited the academic volume as a Soviet historian, edited the 1995 monograph as a Russian historian.

Alas, in one capacity and another they deny the obvious, that is, that the Monroe Doctrine had unambiguously and **above all** anti-Russian orientation!

That is why the Russian Consul General in Philadelphia Fyodor Arkhipovich Ivanov, not without irony and anger, informed Nesselrode on November 24 (December 6), 1823: *"Mr. Count! The Congress of the XVIII convocation met on the 1st of this month in Washington ... The next day the President sent a message to both houses of Congress, one copy of which I have the honor to forward to this c. s-woo ... I will try to briefly state in. that part of the message which relates to the foreign relations of the United States, omitting questions of internal government, its present state, or*

the planned improvement thereof ...

... As for ... the negotiations between the United States and Russia, they are discussed in the presidential message in a very remarkable paragraph, which begins with the words: "At the proposal of the Russian Imperial Government", etc. At the end of the paragraph, the president puts forward a principle that, being convenient to the United States, seems to be considered for this reason as established; the indisputable rights of the European powers, following the same logic, must yield to the so-called principle, which is essentially a matter of convenience for one side, as can be easily seen in other parts of the message.

It was impossible for a Russian person not to be angry here. After all, the Yankees always and in everything cared about convenience. only one side - his own. I do not argue - any people should think about themselves. But at the same time he

must recognize a similar right for others ... However, are children capable of something like that North American "freedom"?

Arrogant narcissism and an organic inability to take into account other people's legitimate interests is the most characteristic feature of US foreign policy from the moment of its formation until the recently begun twenty-first century. Any person who honestly looks at history considers this statement as an elementary truth. No wonder the greatest master of American prose Gore Vidal published in 2002 a book with the bitter title "Why do they hate us? Eternal war for eternal peace.

Alas, yes... For the sanctimonious and hypocritically proclaimed goal of eternal peace, United States long ago plunged humanity into a state of eternal discord and in fact organized three world wars - two "hot" and one "cold". And today they are waging the fourth world war - globally suicidal ... And in terms of sincere, convinced hypocrisy, the policies of the times of Monroe and Adams were no different from the politicians of the times of Bush Sr. and Bush Jr.

That is why even our not very patriotic envoy Theil, after Monroe's speech, deliberately refrained from talking with Adams, about which he reported to his Foreign Ministry, having received from Nesselrode 5

March 1824, a reply dispatch with royal approval, *"His Imperial Majesty,"* Nesselrode wrote, *"can only approve of such restraint. This document put forward such absurd demands and views, it sets out principles so contrary to the mores of the European powers that it deserves only deep contempt. Therefore, Mr. General recommends that you, Mr. General ... pass over the presidential message in silence."*

Of course, here it was necessary not to remain silent, but to protest, but it was already the time of our political and geopolitical capitulations in Russian America and the psychological breakdown of Emperor Alexander the First himself.

Yes, and here the tsar was most likely excited not so much by the attacks of the Yankees in the direction of his power, but by their threats against Spain that go against the "sacred" principles of the Holy Alliance ... for nothing

that on January 3, 1815, in Vienna, secretly from the Russian emperor, a secret allied "defensive" Anglo-Austrian-French treaty was concluded against Russia and Prussia. But how difficult, my dear reader, it was for the author to understand this, wading through the thorns of either a pro-Western conspiracy of silence, or the racial slovenliness of "professional" historians who got lost in the thickets of the "cabbage" densely growing on the current "scientific" Russian fields "bucks color...

I ALREADY wrote that the collection of materials "Russian discoveries in the Pacific Ocean and North America in the XVIII-XIX centuries" was published by the publishing house of the USSR Academy of Sciences in Leningrad in 1944! This strictly documentary publication corresponded very well to the spirit of the era of the triumph of the Russian spirit!

And in 1999, with the financial support of the international scientific foundation "Cultural Initiative", a three-volume "History of Russian America" was prepared, published under the editorship of academician Bolkhovitinov by the publishing house "International Relations".

And this - also, by the way, strictly documentary - edition is also very much in line with the spirit of the era of the conscious humiliation of the Russian spirit! I'll talk about him further, but I mentioned him here because I want to report one fact taken from the petit "Notes on Archival Sources on the History of Russian America" to volume 1 of this three-volume book ... It says that "after World War II war (the Great Patriotic War no longer exists for today's academicians! - S.K.) " Andrey Yanuarevich Vyshinsky, then Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, gave a secret directive of April 29, 1948 on the concentration of all disparate materials on the history of Russian America in one place - in the Archive of the Foreign Policy of the Russian Empire in the special fund "Collection of Documentary Materials on the History of the Russian-American Company and Russian Possessions in North America".

I think this was done not only out of love for Russian history, but also for practical purposes. The story of the sale of Russian America was very doubtful, and before handing it over to the archive (and should it be?), it was necessary to create this archive.

And then you would look...

But things did not go further than the archive (it's good that Stalin's "totalitarianism" managed to collect it at least). Perhaps that is why we are so sluggishly aware and aware of what we had and what we missed!

And we are just as badly aware of how dirty and vile the pressure of the outside world was (primarily the Yankees) on Russia from the very beginning of the emergence of Russian America.

Let's go back to the documentation...

April 21 (May 3), 1808, the leading director of the RAC Mikhail Buldakov and the director of the RAC Benedikt Kramer signed a note "On the undermining made by the Bostonians to the company" ...

This is not a geopolitical analysis. However, the main reason why the Russian business in Russian America was not very "successful" after the "jump" across the ocean was named by Mikhail Matveyevich Buldakov and Venedikt Venediktovich Kramer clearly and precisely ...

In the introduction to the note, they wrote:

"The Russian-American company, which founded in the northwestern part of America trade, industry, fortifications, villages, shipbuilding and every possible economy, and most of all, the adaptation of many wild tribes there to recognize the supreme power of Russia over themselves and profess the same religion with her, although and tries from time to time to increase and improve its institutions, desiring to root even enlightenment itself, establishing tamo for the children of wild schools, and for the poor and female orphans - charitable houses, but

All these efforts are met with strong obstacles.

The only and strong reason is that, since 1792, citizens who began to come to that region on seaworthy merchant ships from 10 to 15 in each year of the North American United States trade in addition to the company with wild Americans living in different places on the islands and on the mother earth. , exchanging with them for their sale in Canton every year, in addition to other fur products, some sea beavers up to 15,000 and up to 5,000 river beavers for the goods they bring, and most of all tools, such as: cannons, falconets, guns, pistols, sabers and other pernicious things and gunpowder, teaching the savages even to use them ... "

This document was internal, not for the government department, not for the royal eyes, but for the Council of the RAC, so everything there was said without pinching and without embellishment ...

And it is said - how sealed!

In 1808, the RAC saw a way out in the state establishment of a standard colonial regime in Russian America: *"We need a gracious allowance from the supreme authority so that foreigners, and especially North American republicans, are forbidden, as is the case in other European colonies in both India, to have a bargain with wild ones, but with only one company, and not anywhere else,*

like on Kodiak ... "

In 1816, the Company saw a way out in the same way... A note to the RAC Council "On the trade of North Americans in the Russian colonies in America" spoke about this and the need to ban the sale of "wild Indians of all kinds of guns, rifles, pistols, sabers, swords, large knives, spears,

and, in a word, no weapons, also gunpowder and lead "...

There are many specific examples in this lengthy note, but I will limit myself to one ... In 1805, the village of Slavorossia was set up in Yakutat Bay, where "several families of both sexes of Russian settlers, cultivators and artisans were settled" ... Aborigines here have long been friendly, and threats a handful of colonists were not expected. But soon the Bostonians supplied the Indians with weapons, urged them on, and they "surprisedly attacked that village, killed all the people, and burned the village, since the one that was there

seagoing ship...

But, to hell with them - with the Bostonians! Rather, I will give the beginning of the RAC note dated December 23, 1816 (January 4, 1817):

"Although Russia did not have fleets until the beginning of the 18th century, but its people, enterprising, resolute and courageous, made many important discoveries on small ships long before that. Back in the 17th century, the Russians bypassed the entire Chukchi Nose by the Arctic Sea - a difficult undertaking even in present time.

The State Archive contains information and evidence that just as long ago the northwestern part of America (relative to the position of Russia and its Asian coast), hitherto unknown to the whole world, was swept up by the Russians, and their first foot was on the mainland, so almost all islands, ranging from the Bering Strait to the Columbia River at 46 ° north latitude.

Russian state geographical expeditions known to the world in 1728, 1733, 1740, 1741, 1764 and 1785. they discovered and described all the places there and, finding them not occupied by any European nation, made them belong to Russia. Her coats of arms erected there, flags fluttering over established fortifications and settlements, the implanted Greek religion professed by it, established schools, charitable and economic institutions testify that from that line and down to the pole, the entire space of North-West America with its islands is the property of Russia. And nothing can dispute its right to do so by its discovery and settled way before other Europeans, who in both Indias acquired their possessions in the same way and right. Are not the possessions of the European powers in the Indies the essence of their colonies?

If some of them already have state treatises on the right of those possessions, then this came from the law of arms; but Russia, for her settled way of life, had neither a dispute nor disagreement with anyone ... "

This is what the Decree of September 4, 1821 was based on: on our right to discover and first occupy, firstly, and on the strict need to protect these rights from arrogant and vile violations of their "North Americans" - secondly!

Why, and officially we informed the Anglo-Saxons about our rights to Russian America - in a rescript Emperor Paul, sent to London by Vorontsov in 1799!

Is it really so difficult for a professional historian to see and, having seen, tell about it?
fellow non-historians?

And instead...

What - "grants" interfere? "Cabbage"?

But, alas, not only, perhaps, in the grants of international funds there is a hitch here!

To the PROBLEM of Russian America, Russian historians are inattentive, so to speak, hereditarily -
No wonder Vernadsky noticed that the history of the sale of Alaska is still waiting for its researcher!

And I must inform the dear reader that I was simply amazed and dumbfounded after acquaintance with how history is covered by our classical pre-revolutionary historians
Russian movement to the Pacific Ocean and beyond ... Movement more than two centuries old, but by historical standards - very fast and by historical standards - almost peaceful.

Yes, I was stunned by the amazing discovery: "No way!"

Neither Karamzin, nor Solovyov, nor Chicherin, nor Ilovaisky, nor Klyuchevsky, not to mention Kostomarov, attached the slightest importance to this topic and absolutely did not draw our attention to it. She if
and passes through them, then not even the third, but the twenty-third plan.

No completely appropriate pathos and admiration for the outstanding feat and achievement of the nation ... No understanding that, after thoughtful reflection, one can come to the conclusion that the whole history of Russia is just a movement through Siberia to the Amur and to the Pacific Ocean ...

Yes Yes exactly! To its Baltic and Black Sea shores, to the Caucasus, Transcaucasia and
We also moved to Central Asia historically and geopolitically logically, legally, but for a long time and with difficulty.

Yes, long!

From Moscow to the Gulf of Riga - less than a thousand kilometers. And we went there for almost two centuries.

And from Moscow to Kamchatka - eight times more. And we went there, too, for two centuries. And the road was which one - through the taiga and swamps, through midges and scurvy ...

But it was the road to the organically, naturally laid down Russia and the great Russian historical and civilizational future.

Lomonosov understood this: "Russian power will grow in Siberia and the Northern Ocean and reaches the main European settlements in Asia and America.

And "notebook" historians - no!

Well, Karamzin, who wrote at the beginning of the 19th century, could somehow be excused if he already in the 18th century, Lomonosov's predecessor did not see the full significance of this Russian movement.

After all, Lomonosov also wrote the history of the Russian state, but did not have time to bring it up to the times of the "Pacific" ... Otherwise, I'm sure, he would have written about Khabarov and Dezhnev in the way that their works before Russia deserved ...

Even more strangely, some people in Russia began to relate to the topic of Russian America after Russia with Russian America said goodbye ...

Here is the encyclopedic dictionary of Brockhaus and Efron ... There is no article about the "American" Baranov, although there is an article "Sheep (not Baranova. -S.K.) island", where it is sparingly reported that this is "one of the islands, belonging to the Territory of Alaska."

There is no article about the "American" Buldakov either, although there is an article about Buldakov Timofey, "serving man of the Yakutsk district", reporting that he is "famous for his travels in the Arctic Sea".

There is an article about Shelikhov, but it is sparing and restrained, like the article about Rezanov. And both "American" themes barely touch.

After all, this is an edition of tsarist times, dear reader!

There is no separate article about Novo-Arkhangelsk in Brockhaus and Efron, but there is a separate article about the village of the Elizavetgrad district of the Kherson region Novoarkhangelsk (Sinyukhin Ford) ...

And about Baranovsky Novo-Arkhangelsk - just a reference "see. Sitha "...

Well, let's see ... "Sitkha, or Novoarkhangelsk - the main city of the North American territory Alaska on the western coast of Baranov Island, belonging to the Alexander Archipelago.

Customs, Russian Orthodox Church, two sawmills, 500 inhabitants, mostly Orthodox.

Sitkha was founded in 1799 and used to be the main city of Russian possessions in North America. In 1880, rich gold-bearing veins were discovered near the city of Sitkha.

Short and unclear... The city is American... And the inhabitants are Orthodox. Territory - American ... And the names on it are Russian ...

However, at least a couple of words about the history of not the vegetating Sith, but the prosperous Novo-Arkhangelsk for some reason, Brockhaus and Efron did not have it.

And here's something else interesting ... At the beginning of each volume of the dictionary is a list of "the most significant original articles in terms of volume." So, the list of such articles for the 53rd half-volume published in 1899 with the article "Russian-American possessions" included the articles "Rose oil" (from three columns, two columns per page), "Dew" (2.5 columns), "Luxury" (3.5 columns), "Turnip" (about 3

columns), "Romanian Church" (about 6 columns), "Rubinshtein A.G." (2.5 columns) and fifty-eight (!) Articles...

But the article "Russian-American possessions", which occupies more than six columns, is not in this list! Didn't deserve...

Other sources of the tsarist time also vaguely narrate about Russian America. About Decree of 4 September 1821, most often they generally keep quiet ...

In a huge, 35-page large text article about Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolayevich in Polovtsev's Russian Biographical Dictionary, nothing is said about the great (not in terms of figure, but in title) prince - even the fact that he contributed to the speedy passage through censorship complete works of the late Gogol. But not a word about Konstantin's participation in the sale of Russian America!

But, it would seem - why not praise! He managed to get a decent price, they say, for a junk product that was already slipping out of his hands ... He found, they say, a new "source of national wealth" ...

But no! Not a word!

Well, it seems they really don't talk about rope in the hanged man's house...

WELL, WHAT ARE THE SOVIET HISTORIANS? Already here, it would seem, everything and everything should have been placed on their assigned places. "Alaska" was sold by the tsars, and not by the Central Committee of the CPSU ...

But no!

Say, a monograph by N.N. Bolkhovitinov - 1990 edition, titled "Russian-American Relations and the Sale of Alaska. 1834-1867". The author later complained about how difficult it was for him in the "CC-CPSU" times to get it printed. Let's assume that this is so. But in fact in this monograph already the name gives falsification. Was it in Alaska alone? And was Professor Bolkhovitinov not aware of something here? After all, he is not a singer Rastorguev, and he must understand that only the name "Sale of Russian America" or "Sale of Alaska and the Pacific Islands" can be true ...

But for some reason, readers' attention is drawn to only part of the problem - to Alaska alone! IN what's the matter? Printing paints regretted a few extra letters, or what?

Or did all this come from a desire to deliberately downplay in the public mind the scale and significance of our loss? In particular, the loss of the Aleut as an advanced geopolitical frontier for Russia, giving it the right to the regime of the Bering Sea as an inland sea.

In volume VI of the capital "World History", published by the Publishing House of Socio-Economic Literature in 1959 and covering the period from the French Revolution of 1789-1794 to the Paris Commune of 1871, there is not a word about the sale of Russian America.

Not a word!

And even in the summary chronology of the period considered in this volume, there is nothing about her. About the events of 1821, it was reported that this year John Constable created the painting "Hay Cart" ... And nothing about the Decree of September 4, 1821.

In February-March 1867, there was no more important event for the authors of the World History than the uprising of the Irish Fenians.

Yes, even Soviet historians did not cross the border of the former Russian America.

And there is no question of the current "Russian" bans from history and in general! Despite the newest three-volume book "History of Russian America" mentioned by me and some TV fuss around the problem, its history is now covered with smoke screens even more densely.

I don't understand what's the matter here ... Maybe it stretches along, so to speak, inheritance, from the time of the "wise scribblers" and Professor Okun?

Although Brockhaus and Efron did not include the article on Russian America among the "most significant original articles" of their own 53rd volume, they devoted three pages to it. True, there was not **a word about the sale of Alaska either**, only once was a deaf phrase "ceding possessions to the United States" used.

The very first Soviet TSB - for nothing that came out under the editorship of Otto Yulievich Schmidt, reduced information about the RAC to one column, without giving, like Brockhaus and Efron, articles neither about Baranov, nor about Buldakov, nor - moreover, about Rezanov, saying about Shelikhov a few words.

What, they were afraid to worsen our relations with the United States? God forbid, and by 1933 we were not would have recognized ... What an affront it would have been for the People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the USSR Meer-Maxim Wallakh Litvinov! After all, he was so eager for this recognition that he was ready to pay even the mythical White Guard debts to Roosevelt ...

The "Stalinist" TSB, the second, tells in most detail and clearly about Russian America and its heroes. The third TSB, "Brezhnev's", devoted two articles "Russian-American Company" and "Russian America" to the topic in "whole" one and a half columns in total.

It can be seen that this has been the custom since tsarist times, and it has remained so - you can't offend Uncle Sam, Uncle Sam may be offended.

Thank you, even though the third TSB said a kind word about Alexander Andreevich Baranov: "Thanks to the energy and administrative abilities of Baranov, the connections of Russian settlements in North America with California, the Hawaiian Islands and China have significantly expanded. New settlements were created. A number of expeditions were equipped to explore the areas of the Pacific coast, shipbuilding, copper smelting and coal mining were launched, a school was organized in Alaska, etc. Baranov participated in the study and description of the Chugach Bay, adjacent islands and other areas ... An island in the Alexander archipelago was named after Baranov.

That's right, only one thing is missing ... The fact that the Russian patriot Baranov, because of the betrayal of the kings, himself about not knowing that, he actually tried for his uncle ...

For Uncle Sam.

Now, in the 21st century, the topic has become even more inconvenient for "regular" historians - God forbid you inadvertently catch it wrong, but then what about the "sponsors" from across the ocean, with their "green cabbage"?

Let's return to the three-volume 1999 "History of Russian America" ... On the "super" of the first volume there are beautiful words about "courageous Russian people", that Russian America was "an integral part of the The annotation also says this: "The authors seek to overcome the stereotypes and clichés common in Soviet historiography regarding the "progressiveness" of Russian colonization. They also try not to ignore the "Indian factor" and not to exaggerate the scale of the external "threat" to Russia's possessions.

So, so... At first, these same authors (all former Soviet specialists on Russian America, headed by N.N. Bolkhovitinov) created clichés and stereotypes, and now they themselves will

"overcome"?

And it turns out that there was no threat to our possessions from the Yankees? So why then they had to sell? They would be listed for Russia and were listed. Here on the island of Kerguelen, the French did not show their nose for decades, and it remains to this day behind them.

And about the "Indian factor" ... If you think about it, its whole essence fits into the revealing words that the author of Indian novels, the German Karl May, put into the mouth of his noble hero Old Shetterhand: "I have long been convinced that it is the whites who incite the Indians to loot and kill".

And the Russian historian is obliged, first of all, in the light of the incitement and provocation of the Anglo-Saxons to see all our conflicts with the Indians.

Or - here's another one ... In the annotation on the dust jacket of the third volume, the authors - in line with the thoughts and feelings of Pushkin's interlocutor in 1833, the secretary of the English embassy Bligh and other Vorontsovs, Lamberts and Nesselrod - talk about the "continental" future of Russia and proudly report that Russia was the first of the European powers to give up its "overseas possessions". As if Alaska, the Aleutians and the island (let's not forget) Lawrence were for Russia what Hong Kong was for England or Belgium - Belgian Congo...

At the same time, on the same third "super" the sale of Russian America is explained by the "difficulty of protecting distant American possessions," which does not agree well with the thesis of the first "super" about "exaggerating the scale of the external threat." If there was no threat, then what is the difficulty of defense?

But there were times when N.N. himself recognized the seriousness of the threat. Bolkhovitinov was then a corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. In his article "How Alaska was sold", published in the magazine of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs "Mezhdunarodnaya Zhizn" in July 1988 and which became the embryo of a 1990 monograph, he stated: "Much more important in deciding the fate of Alaska (Again! Why only Alaska? - S. K.) had an external threat, and first of all, the expansion of the United States. True, an external threat to Russian possessions in North America has existed for many years. It was especially acute during the years of the Crimean War on the part of England (which is actually not true. - S.K.), as well as on the part of the United States (which is true in all respects! - S.K.), whose positions in the Pacific North are all more strengthened (exclusively because Russia voluntarily gave up its positions there. - S.K.).

So was the "boy" in the "cabbage", Nikolai Nikolaevich, or not?

And the conceptual essence of all three volumes of the "Russian-American" three-volume edition of 1999 fully corresponds to the spirit of dust jackets. A lot of exact facts and absolutely incorrect conclusions from them, contradicting the reported (and even more so - unreported) facts themselves.

And a particularly sad impression is left by the last section of the third volume "Instead of a conclusion", written by a single "Russian" academician with a Russian surname Bolkhovitinov. A lot of amazing there...

There is also regret that the State Duma of the Russian Federation did not ratify Gorbachev's gift from the Yankees in 1990 - still on behalf of the USSR - fifty-five thousand square kilometers of shelf in the Bering Sea ...

And suggesting to readers thoughts about the inevitability and regularity of our loss not only of the already lost Russian America, but even the Russian Kuriles, and even almost the Wrangel Islands in the Arctic Ocean ...

And quite out of the merrily green "cabbage" peeps out the "boy" - the thesis about the need to de-ratify the SALT-2 Treaty ...

Academician Bolkhovitinov wrote this in 1999, when the topic of START-2 (and not SALT-2, as he erroneously pointed out) was still relevant and when the author of this book, along with other Russian people, fought against the pro-American "treaty" START-2 disarming Russia.

In the desire to "lick" Uncle Sam, our "expert" here confused the discriminating Russia, the "Yeltsin" "treaty" of 1993 with the equal "Brezhnev" Treaty of 1979 with the United States on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms - SALT-2, the implementation of which was thwarted by themselves

yankees.

And it was free for such academic professors already in Soviet times to be "noble" to be indignant - what an "unclean Alaskan deal" there! What a "betrayal of national interests"! Money, they say, Russia did not have the strength to keep Russian America. Thank you, please

to the US Senate for the fact that he, they say, barely agreed to pay us at least something.

Otherwise, the Yankees could have taken ours from us for "free of charge", international law and **the same United States recognized** state territories.

And as it turned out, they strengthened the alliance between Russia and the United States, eliminated the reasons for possible conflicts.

However, let me remind you that on October 20, 1861, Captain 2nd Rank Golovin warned the tsars (and, for the future, also Russian academic historians, and not only them): "As for the strengthening of friendly relations between Russia and the United States, we can positively say that sympathy Americans will show up to us as long as it does not oblige them to anything or as long as it is for them

beneficial."

So, a simple Russian officer Golovin understood everything, and the tsars, that is, the supreme Russian power, - No?

And do the current academicians, together with the current supreme Russian authorities, understand this?

RETURNING back to the years immediately after the sale of Russian America, I will say - what the hell is the lack of funds! Ten years after this sale, Alexander, with his dignitary company, climbed into the Balkans - to free the "Slav brothers" and get into foreign debts, no longer up to their ears, but up to their heads. Now a professional "liberator" has turned out to be on the Russian neck!

Yes, and the ministers were, as a rule, a match for him ... Let's say, on the name of His Serene Highness Prince and Chancellor Alexander Mikhailovich Gorchakov, there are reflections of the Pushkin Lyceum, but personally, dear reader, this "state mind" does not cause much enthusiasm for me.

From 1856 to 1882 he was the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Russia. He is credited with canceling restrictive articles of the Paris Treaty of 1856, which ended the Crimean War.

But these articles were canceled by those Russian people who, in spite of the near lordship, and even the betrayal of their supreme power, worked in the name of the might of Russia and the creation of its new fleet. People like Admiral Popov and ship engineers Okunev and Leontiev, like the artisans of the shipyards of Galerny Island and the Nikolaev Admiralty, and people like the Russian peasants who fed these artisans with bread ...

In 1875, contrary to common sense, Gorchakov thwarted Germany's plans to wage another war with France (which was indirectly beneficial for Russia by strengthening good relations with Germany).

And on the eve of the Russian-Turkish war of 1877-1878, he ensured us the neutrality of European states. And why not, if this war was indirectly beneficial for these states - for some, Russia dragged chestnuts out of its fire, for others (like England, for example) it was beneficial to draw us into debt swamp and weaken ...

If only Gorchakov had managed to avoid this war! True, it is believed that Gorchakov restrained the militant Slavophilism of Alexander II (general Ignatiev incited the tsar). But it didn't give any effect. If Gorchakov had not held back the Germans, then the weakening of the French would have held back the Turks, and the strengthening of Germany would have provided a headache for the British and would have limited their support for the same Turks. Clever, in the language of the military theorist Englishman Liddell Hart, "strategy of indirect actions" was needed by Russia. And - what is important, it was possible for her!

But to carry out such a strategy, one had to have a really broad statesmanship. And if his brightest fellow student Pushkin had it, then we, perhaps, would not have missed Russian America ...

And so...

No, a mediocre monarch cannot have gifted diplomats.

Academician Sergei Danilovich, Skazkin, in his article about Gorchakov for the 1st Great Soviet Encyclopedia, assessed him harshly and fairly at the end of the 20s: "Nesselrode was his boss, Metternich and Talleyrand and the society of high-profile diplomats, where manners, elegant French speech and subtle wit were combined with a significant dose of aristocratic ignorance (later we will see how Gorchakov did not want to delve into the Central Asian situation. - S.K.) and a firm belief that the fate of peoples and states is decided by a skillful diplomatic game in caches of diplomatic offices.

Yes, this is a portrait, not Slavophile icon painting!

I already wrote about the RUSSIAN-Turkish war of 1877-1878 in my book "Russia and Germany: Set Off" as about a war for Russia unnecessary, redundant. I talked about it in this book...

Yes, Alexander's Minister of War, Dmitry Alekseevich Milyutin, on the eve of this war, submitted a note to the tsar, where he wrote that a Russian-Turkish clash "would be truly a great disaster for us."

Alas!

And I will also give the opinion of Grand Duke Alexander Mikhailovich - about this war, and something else about than what he expressed in his memoirs already in the 20th century ...

"Events of 1877-1878. seem now, after fifty years, - he wrote, - completely incomprehensible: should one admire the foresight of Disraeli or regret the innocence of the Russian imperial government?"

Perhaps it would be more correct if we did not interfere in the Balkan affairs, but some dark motives led Lord Beaconsfield (Disraeli. - S.K.) ... After all, one word from London would be enough to immediately stop a series of murders prepared by Turkish government in the Slavic countries ...

Slowly advancing for almost two years through the semi-wild lands of the Balkans, the Russian army actually waged a fierce campaign against the British Empire. The Turkish army was armed with excellent British rifles of the latest system. The Sultan's generals followed the instructions of the British commanders...

"The old Jew is a big man," said Bismarck... However, there is no justification for Russian diplomacy, which, instead of neutralizing Disraeli's move with a Russian-German alliance, began to promote a senseless, even fatal rapprochement between Russia and France and Great Britain."

The memoirs of the Grand Duke do not differ in special analytical brilliance, but he wrote them very

sincerely (sometimes even to the point of self-exposure that he did not notice), and sometimes he was accurate and deep in astonishment. And therefore, the above estimates, as they say, are worth a lot!

We were still capable of reaching the Black Sea straits (yes, in fact, we did during the war), but we did not have the slightest chance to hold and control them. We could secure for ourselves a natural expansion of the territory in the Caucasus, limiting ourselves to only a small share of the expenses we incurred for the big war. And - with little blood, and not, read it, with two hundred thousand lives of Russian soldiers - killed, died of wounds and diseases, who perished in Turkish captivity ... The lives with which Russia paid for the freedom of the Bulgarian "brothers", now spitting on Russians.

In that geopolitical situation, Russia would not have managed to do without a conflict with Turkey, but we had to avoid a protracted conflict, without going further than what we could obviously claim (that is, in the Caucasus). A protracted conflict was harmful to Russia, but beneficial ...

In order to understand who benefited from the permanent confrontation between Russia and Turkey, I will cite here, perhaps, the contents of the dispatch of Peter Poletika to Karl Nesselrode, mentioning these two unsympathetic names to me on the pages of this book, probably for the last time ...

So, on September 23, in the Russian style of 1821, Poletika reported from Washington that the concentration of the Russian army on the Prut is seen in the United States as a harbinger of the beginning of a continental war in Europe, which is "an object of hot desire" for the United States. Like, local shipowners and farmers can't wait for the declaration of war between Russia and the Ottoman Empire in

hope that the closure of the port of Odessa will allow them to increase the price of American grain and increase shipping cost.

Like this.

WELL, AND WHAT has changed here for almost two centuries, my dear reader? The European war, as it was, and remains the "object of hot desires" of the Yankees.

They carefully prepared the two largest such wars - the First and Second World Wars ...

They provoked Europe into a third "cold" such war by creating NATO.

They are intensively carrying out neo-Balkanization already in the new century.

And they are brazenly destroying - with their own policy and the hands of domestic Russian residents and "presidents", the future of Russia and are programming its conflict with Europe ...

But this time, perhaps, together with the Europeans, we will be smarter?

And after that long-standing Russian-Turkish war, Russia's public debt grew (hold on, reader!) to 6 billion rubles, and the payment of debt obligations absorbed a third of state revenues - 240 million rubles.

And Russia paid!

Here they are - the means by which we could both keep and support Russian America!

And is it only her?

The exchange rate of the ruble in London fell to 25 pence... About these times, Saltykov-Shchedrin wrote that it was nothing when they give fifty kopecks for a ruble, it will be worse when they give you a ruble in the face.

Well, such times came only in the 21st century - today they won't give you a Russian ruble in the face. Why rip off a fist in vain?

And today, just like in the past, we are depriving ourselves of attractive geopolitical prospects.

(how we ourselves can still find them again).

A century and a half ago, Russia was deprived of such prospects by the monarchy. And even her faithful servants - if they they also served Russia - they understood this in real time ...

A young employee of the Asian Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Fyodor Osten-Saken, learned about the special meeting on December 16, 1866, which decided the sale of Russian America, most likely from his boss, the deputy department of Engelhardt. And on the same evening he wrote his note, which no longer changed anything, but today it proves once again that Russian tsars were lucky to have sensible subjects, and Russian chancellors were lucky to have sensible young subordinates, but subjects and subordinates were rarely lucky to have tsars and chancellors (Austen - Saken did not go very far, eventually becoming the head of the secondary Department of Foreign Relations of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs).

Here are the main theses of Osten-Sacken:

"The reasons for selling our American colonies are, as far as is known, as follows:

- 1) The complete uselessness of these colonies for Russia.*
- 2) Fears that sooner or later they will be taken away from us.*
- 3) Benefits to get for them a fairly significant amount of money.*

For the first reason:

Are we now in a position to form a definite idea of whether these colonies can be useful to Russia or not?

... From the uselessness of the Company (Austen-Saken admitted that the RAC was already untenable as a guarantor of Russian America, and at that time it was not a statement that was totally wrong. - S.K.) is it possible to draw a conclusion about the uselessness of the land itself, which it was in charge of and about which we positively know nothing (here he only proved out of hand the poor information support of the activities of Gorchakov's department. - S.K.).

For the second argument:

The position of our American colonies in the world of political relations can be called especially advantageous (here it meant the mutually neutralizing rivalry between England and the United States, and although "rivalry" was often quoted, Osten-Sacken was right that the presence of Canada was beneficial to us - S.K.) ... As long as the current order of things exists in North America, it is hardly reasonable to fear the seizure of our Colonies by another power.

For the third reason:

... Several million or even tens of millions of rubles are hardly of national importance in an empire that has about half a billion in annual income and expenditure and more than one and a half billion in debt ... "

Osten-Sacken made the obvious conclusion: *"Through the sale of our American colonies, the historical distribution of the North American mainland between the three great powers will be disrupted ... Now the balance beneficial for us in the northwestern corner of America ... will be destroyed irrevocably."*

In the end, he wrote that the "positive benefits" of our American colonies belong only to the future, *"but it would seem that the present generation has a sacred duty to preserve for future generations every piece of land lying on the shores of the Ocean, which has a world*

meaning".

This is the note...

And such are the things.

"HOWEVER, the Pacific lethargy of the supreme power was to some extent redeemed by our Central Asian activity, the reader may notice. "The author himself began chapter 9 with a description of it."

Alas, even here the activity came not so much from St. Petersburg, but from energetic Russians, far from capitals and metropolitan salons!

I have already mentioned the campaigns of Colonel Chernyaev, and now I will return to them to show that he had to act in Central Asia in the same way as Nevelsky in the Far East, that is, almost in a partisan way.

Mikhail Grigorievich Chernyaev was born in 1828, that is, by the time of his Central Asian campaigns he was not even forty ... In 1865-1866 he was appointed military governor of the Turkestan region, and why he ceased to be one, I'll tell you now ...

Then, together with the retired General Fadeev and Colonel Komarov, he published the Russkiy Mir newspaper (according to the 2nd TSB - "reactionary"). The last, by the way, of this "trio" - Vissarion Vissarionovich Komarov was a representative of the famous military dynasty of the Komarovs, a prominent figure in Slavophilism, popular in Russia and in the foreign Slavic world.

The Russkiy Mir newspaper stood in opposition to the reforms of Minister of War Milyutin, which in itself does not mean anything - on the whole, the reforms were necessary and true, but even twenty years after the Crimean War, the reformed Russian army turned out to be not very good. combat-ready even in the eastern theater of operations. So the temper of the three retirees was in something, perhaps

place.

On the eve of the Russian-Turkish war, Chernyaev, on the proposal of Alexander, was appointed commander-in-chief of the Serbian army in the Serbian-Turkish war (Komarov was there with him). But the general did not earn glory on that - the Serbs suffered defeats, but was Chernyaev guilty of that, to say now is also difficult.

Later, Chernyaev became the main prototype (together with Generals Fadeev and Gurko) of General Polkan Samsonovich Rededi, introduced in Saltykov-Shchedrin's "Modern Idyll" ("...Remember that Rededya went to liberate Serbia, stirred up all of Russia ... Rededi's combat reputation was largely exaggerated. His comrades in the noble regiment, however, claimed that he considered himself several dashing skirmishes in Tashkent, but somehow it was never sufficiently explained whether these skirmishes took place in geographical Tashkent or in the Tashkent tavern, which is behind the Narva outpost ... ").

However, the irony of our great satirist was hardly out of place here - Chernyaev's "skirmishes" took place in Tashkent geographical. And what is the political background...

Our activity in Central Asia was explained not so much by a clear understanding of the geopolitical and state necessity of it by the highest power, but by ... the desire to divert the attention of England from Russian Poland (incited by the Anglo-French).

Prior to this, not only the Gorchakov department, but even the Minister of War Milyutin was more than cool related to the proposals of the governor-generals of Western Siberia and Orenburg for Central Asia.

And the Governor-General of Orenburg, Alexander Pavlovich Bezak, back in 1861 in a note to Milyutin

proposed offensive tactics, and it was he who proposed connecting the Orenburg and Siberian fortified lines. And it was thanks to Bezak that the Syr-Darya line was established in 1861.

Bezak was not just a general - he was the son of a highly educated and active official Pavel Khristianovich Bezak and Susanna Yakovlevna Rachette, daughter of the famous sculptor Jean Dominique Rachette, a Russified Frenchman, professor at the St. Petersburg Academy of Arts.

Alexander Pavlovich's father collaborated with Bekleshov, Prozorovsky, Bagration, Speransky (After the latter's exile, he resigned and, having engaged in commerce, became very rich).

Bezak's grandfather, Christian Khristianovich, professor of philosophical, political and historical sciences at the St. Petersburg Land Cadet Corps, came from an old Slavic Bezatsky family, who changed their surname to German during the Reformation. Having entered the Russian service in 1760, at the age of thirty-three, he was respected and valued by Catherine and became one of the "first-granted" holders of the Order of St. Vladimir.

Therefore, the grandson of such a grandfather had a far from provincial outlook, and he looked at Russian prospects in Central Asia with a truly sovereign, that is, broadly and comprehensively.

Bezak wrote to Milyutin that with a smart line of conduct, Russia would receive both a new reliable state border and the possibility of cheaply supplying the forts on the Syr Darya with food and forest, and deposits of lead ores.

That's who would go to the ministers, and not necessarily - in the military! Later - in 1865, Bezak was, however, appointed commander of the troops of the Kyiv military district and governor-general of Kyiv, Volyn and Podolia. And in this post, he seriously clipped the wings of the Polish landowners (as a result of his harsh redemption measures, the peasants ended up with 4 million acres of land). But he did not pursue such a line for long - in 1868 he went on business to St. Petersburg and there (wow, how it coincided!) died, only sixty-seven years old.

So, Alexander Pavlovich Bezak offered energy in Central Asia. Dmitry Alekseevich Milyutin considered all this "untimely".

As for Gorchakov, he generally resisted offensive tactics in Central Asia. Milyutin later recalled that Gorchakov "alien the most superficial information about Asia (and about Russian America, I will add already. - S.K.), did not even want to delve (yes! - S.K.) into the circumstances that forced us from time to time to take military measures on our Asian outskirts, and attributed any military enterprise to the willfulness of local military commanders, their desire for military distinctions and awards (it was free for His Serene Highness Prince Gorchakov, hung with orders to the navel and reached the rank of Chancellor, to blame dusty border officers for such ! - S.K.)".

And only the Polish unrest somehow moved the situation from its place. The detachments of Chernyaev and Verevkin - what we already know.

In September 1864, the Orenburg and Siberian lines were connected by the capture of Turkestan and Chimkent. Gorchakov and Milyutin decided to limit themselves to this, but Chernyaev was a resolute man and, as they say, prone to adventure.

And why not - in a situation where the line between a bold initiative and a gamble is almost impossible to draw? It will turn out, they will say: "Pioneer". If he breaks, they will say: "Adventurer" ... And here it is important to think not about what they will say *about you*, but about how to do better *for the Motherland!*

That's what Chernyaev did. And I tried to take the largest city of Central Asia - Tashkent. But in failed the first time.

Gorchakov short-sightedly reassured "Europe" about the fact that there would be no further expansion of the border by Russia. The Yankees were allowed to expand on their continent, the British, French, Dutch, Belgians - all over the world. And Russia could not take a step towards natural borders without all the guardians of "universal values" making a fuss and din...

So Gorchakov was beside himself from Chernyaev's "willfulness". And sharply accused Milyutin of connivance, demanding the punishment of Chernyaev.

In a word, the story with Nevelsky was somewhat repeated, with the only difference that Chernyaev was judged then it was easy - he was not a winner.

However, Milyutin reasonably answered Gorchakov: "Fear of responsibility for any deviation from instructions can kill energy and enterprise. There are cases when the boss must take on his own responsibility an enterprise that could not be envisaged in a pre-planned program.

And all this despite the fact that in the political Central Asian program of October 1864, presented to the tsar jointly by Gorchakov and Milyutin, special attention was paid to Tashkent, as a point of great political and commercial importance for Russia.

Almost a year passed, June 1865 came, and, pushed only by his active nature, Chernyaev again goes to Tashkent. And this time it takes with minimal losses. Chernyaev is enthusiastically greeted by many public and military figures, and this time the authorities are more favorable to him. In the summer of 1866, Tashkent was included in Russia, and Chernyaev was made governor-general of the Turkestan region.

And here Chernyaev once again acted arbitrarily and swung at Bukhara. Here came a misfire, and Chernyaev was removed from Central Asia (however, in 1882-1884 he again served as the Turkestan governor-general).

Personally, Mikhail Grigorievich was, admittedly, really confused. But Tashkent became Russian at a very critical moment in history thanks to his determination.

Alas, decisiveness and audacity were already completely excluded from the qualities of the highest Russian "state" persons. At the turn of the 20th and 19th centuries, audacity is replaced by a mixture of heaviness and, oddly enough, mediocre adventurism.

This was most clearly manifested in the Far Eastern policy of the son of Alexander II - Alexander Third, and then - and his son Nicholas II. And we'll talk more about this...

The RUSSIA of Alexander II was already a state entangled in three pines and entangled in a web of foreign debts. Two years before the execution of the emperor by the Narodnaya Volya, Dmitry Alekseevich Milyutin wrote in a secret diary of 1879:

"The state structure of Russia requires a radical reform from the bottom to the top... everything has outlived its time... But such a reform is beyond our current statesmen, who are not able to rise above the point of view of the chief of police or even the policeman."

It was Russia's assessment of Alexander the Liberator. After the executed father was replaced by a son, the situation worsened even more. And even Milyutin had to leave the highest echelon of power under Alexander III.

Under Peter the Great, Senator Yakov Dolgoruky, who disagreed with the decree already signed by the tsar, could break this decree in front of Peter himself and receive gratitude for it! Upon the reign of Alexander

I couldn't even think of a third one! The chief prosecutor of the Holy Synod of Pobedonostsev, the teacher of both Alexander III himself and his son, the future Nicholas II, was included in the force. Pobedonostsev's symbol of faith was the formula "autocracy, Orthodoxy, nationality"...

Immediately after the explosion on March 1, 1881, the Executive Committee of the "Narodnaya Volya" addressed the new emperor in a printed leaflet. The forces of the Narodnaya Volya, and until March 1, constantly weakened by arrests and executions, were running out. Zhelyabov, Perovskaya, Mikhailov, Kibalchich and Rysakov were to be executed; But revolutionary Russia addressed the tsar loudly, and her address, which in practical terms did not "work", was read with sympathy by many, and it deserved.

"Your Majesty! - it said. - Fully understanding the painful mood that you are experiencing at the present moment, the Executive Committee does not, however, consider itself entitled to succumb to a sense of natural delicacy, requiring, perhaps, for the following explanation to wait some time. There is something higher than the most legitimate feelings of a person: this is a duty to his native country ...

The bloody tragedy that broke out on the Catherine Canal was not an accident ... Only a person who is completely incapable of analyzing the life of peoples can explain such facts by the malicious intent of individuals or at least a "gang" ...

... Why does this sad need for a bloody struggle come about?

Because, Your Majesty, we now have no real government in its true sense. The government, by its very principle, should only express the people's aspirations, only carry out the people's will. Meanwhile, in our country—pardon the expression—the government has degenerated into a pure camarilla and deserves the name of a usurper gang much more than the Executive Committee... The Imperial Government... handed over the masses to the power of the nobility; at the present time it is openly creating the most harmful class of speculators and speculators...

There can be two ways out of this situation: either a revolution, completely inevitable, which cannot be prevented by any executions, or the voluntary appeal of the supreme power to the people ... "

Here it was openly said that Milyutin expressed "about himself" ... However, the answer was the tsar's manifesto of April 29, 1881, written by Pobedonostsev, where the fortification was proclaimed autocracy.

The Narodnaya Volya called for free all-estate elections in conditions of freedom of speech and gatherings, and the king declared that no public participation in the affairs of state administration would be allowed.

And even such a super-monarchist as General Yepanchin, the author of the memoirs "In the Service of the Three Emperors", admitted that Pobedonostsev "can rightfully be given the title" of "the evil genius of Russia" ...

Agree! But one asks - and all these general-admirals-konstantins, ministers-"city guards", Lionella-jackals Rothschilds, Stieglitz and Stecks - were they good Russian geniuses?

And those who allowed them to power over Russia, all these crowned bearers, are they also nothing to do with it?

In his article "Power and bosses," Pobedonostsev wrote: *"Power, as the bearer of truth, needs most of all people of truth, people of firm thought, strong understanding and the right word, in whom yes and no do not touch and do not merge, but independently and separately arise in the spirit and are expressed in the word. The right man is a whole man, who does not tolerate splitting. Only such people can be a firm support of power and its faithful leaders."*

The above words are beautiful words expressing true, profound thoughts. But, expressed by one of the ideological pillars of Russia, Alexander the Third, these words, taking into account the real situation with the "people of power" in Russia at the end of the 19th century, on the eve of the rise of figures like Witte, sounded mocking!

Direct antipodes of Pobedonostsev's ideal determined the nerve of the era of Alexander II...

And now came **a similar** era of Alexander the Last, and after it - and Nicholas Last...

In THIS era, as always in Russia, vile deeds were mixed with glorious deeds. Here is a brief pre-revolutionary history of the Russian Diesel plant (it received such a name already in 1919) ...

In 1849 it was founded in St. Petersburg as an iron foundry, mechanical, ship repair.

Since 1870 - Nobel's factory. Produces weapons and ammunition by order of the military department, as well as turning and drilling machines, steam hammers, hydraulic presses.

Since 1878, he also began to produce equipment for the oil industry and the first world railway tank cars for the transportation of oil and kerosene.

In 1899, the world's first industrial diesel engine was created there. on crude oil.

In 1903, the world's first marine diesel engine was produced, installed on the world's first motor ship - oil tanker "Vandal" ...

The glorious history of only one plant ... But behind it, not only

Nobel's money (and provided by Russia), and the talent, work, thought and sweat of the Russian people ...

But Russian power at this time is more and more often skillfully directed sideways - so that it is wasted and this already ensures the success and power of others. Russia is going out more and more widely into the outside world, but there it is drawn into adventures. And its policy in the Far East is becoming more and more adventurous.

We have always had enough strong people in the Far East and Siberia. And if they themselves were not always sufficiently energetic and enterprising, then Central and Northern Russia always supplied active people to those places in abundance (it is enough to recall the biographies of Shelikhov, Buldakov, Baranov, Kuskov to be convinced of this). What do we know about the modest, small Russian town of Lalsk on the Vyatka River Luza? But he also gave Russia more than one hero of Russian America ...

These active people went to the shores of the Pacific Ocean and moved on - to the Aleuts, to Alaska, to Kuriles...

They also went out to the left bank of the Amur. And beyond the Amur they went only to the left bank of the Ussuri.

But no further...

I have already talked a lot about natural borders, and here I will also say that it seems that the Russian people (namely, the people in their common masses) have always had a natural precise geopolitical instinct that allowed them to go no further than reasonable, their own \

If in the West the shifts in national borders were the work of kings - within Europe, and the same kings, coupled with the greedy adventurers supported by them, then in Russia the borders to the east promoted at first by the people themselves, and only then they were consolidated by the royal power.

Perhaps, and therefore the same Russian-American company, even during its greatest activity never tried to settle *beyond* the Amur.

Along the Amur - from the left bank side, in the zone between the Amur and Quiet ocean yes! But in Chinese, say, Manchuria - no, no! Why, if it's not ours?

Clever Russian people have held tight to the Amur region since the time of the Nerchinsk Treaty of 1689, and for these lands they were always ready to go into conflict with China.

And they walked, and were tough and uncompromising - like Muravyov-Amursky, like Nevelskoy.

But those same people were clearly aware that Manchuria was not our sphere of political interests. How true - in principle, but not on a specific occasion, Ekaterina noted, trading is one thing, owning is quite another...

Manchuria - even Northern, trans-Amur, was in the understanding of those Russian patriots who were committed to the Far Eastern region of Russia, the territory of legitimately Chinese. Yes, it was so according to all the rules of God and man.

But just as firmly these patriots were convinced that the Amur region on *this* side of the Amur was the rightful Russian land. And here they were ready to go to the displeasure of high bureaucrats, to take risks and hardships in order for the sun to rise over the Amur region for Russia.

Alas, less than thirty years will pass after the sale of Russian America, and Witte's anti-Russian policy will finally bury the ideas and principles of the Russian pioneers. This policy will drag Russia to *the other* side of the Amur and lead it to discord with Japan and the collapse of the prospects for sustainable peace in the Far East.

In the second half of the 19th century, Russia reached the Amur and owned Russian America. By retaining both of these zones, Russia secured an excellent place for itself on the shores of that ocean, which Herzen called the "Mediterranean Sea of the Future."

The American Commander John Rogers, having visited the Amur, was confident in its great future and wrote as follows: "This is the great highway that nature has laid from the shores of the Pacific Ocean to the center of Siberia."

Rogers believed that extensive trade would arise on the banks of the Amur, and a city would rise at the mouth, to whom he prophesied the fate of the Russian San Francisco.

The future of the Amur and the Amur region - as it was seen by the Yankees, as well as

the founding of Vladivostok were, of course, additional reasons that the Yankees were in a hurry to buy Russian America. And they were in such a hurry that when the issue was decided in their favor, Seward could not even endure a couple of days of the weekend and managed everything in one night ...

In one day, and even in one hour, the geopolitical fate of Russia was decided and on a special meeting in Petersburg.

But RUSSIA had a chance to dominate the entire Pacific Ocean, and even in its north - for sure. And its northern part, beyond the Aleuts, could be inland Russian waters.

The same Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, with a smart state policy, could grow in a matter of years into a considerable city and a mighty fortress - as a solid strategic base, reinforcing Russian America from Russian Asia and strengthening Russian Far Eastern Asia itself.

Nikolai Nikolaevich Muravyov (not yet Amursky), who had just been appointed Governor-General of Eastern Siberia, wrote to St. Petersburg after visiting Kamchatka: "*I have seen many ports in Russia and Europe, but I have not seen anything like the Avacha Bay; England should deliberately make a two-week break with Russia in order to take possession of it and then make peace, but she will not give us Avacha Bay already, and even if she paid us a million pounds for her at the conclusion of peace, then*

help him out in a short time from whaling in the Sea of Okhotsk and the Bering Sea."

By the way, once again - about the Bering Sea ... Even in the twenties of the XX century, after all the looting of its wealth by the Anglo-Saxons, it was the richest sea, but - where? Somehow, looking at the "economic" map of the Bering Sea, given in the 1st TSB, I once again sighed ... The absolute number of icons indicating fishing, whaling and fur seals turned red and black in the central and northeastern parts of the map. Where once there were Russian waters and Russian shores of Russian America...

With the loss of Russian America, Russia could no longer conceive projects in the Pacific that were possible in the past. Now she could only be present in the Pacific Ocean. However, the question still remained - how?

To be present in so far as, or is it powerful, weighty?

Muravyov considered the second option to be realistic. But here's how an eyewitness, a Russian military sailor, described Petropavlovsk even in 1910:

"It is difficult... to call a small village like Petropavlovsk in those days a city. It numbered only 600 inhabitants, including military guards from the Ussuri Cossacks ... The abundance of shops selling alcoholic beverages was striking. I remember there was even a platform in front of the porch of one merchant, all paved with vodka bottles upside down."

Petropavlovsk seemed to all of us sleepy, deserted, almost extinct ... We shared our dull impressions with our guide. Startled by our remark, he burst out hands:

- Pardon me, it's summer now, the height of navigation. Our life is in full swing. Russian, American, Japanese ships come to us. Fur auction happens. Industrialists come here from all over Kamchatka. This is our busiest time of the year..."

THIS IS HOW even in 1910 the place that Muravyov-Amursky described sixty years ago looked like I was worried that the British would chop it off from us, and then they wouldn't give it back for a million.

However, the Americans were now gaining more and more strength in the Pacific, although the British, the French, and then the Germans had long since firmly established themselves in China. A completely new Japanese factor was emerging, about which more than a lot will be said later ...

And a new situation was created ... Moreover, the Yankees now did what they denied us the right to do. The riches of the former Russian America were severely depleted by years of poaching. At first, it was poaching by the Yankees, and after the "furry" islands came under the jurisdiction of the United States, the British and Canadians began to intensively beat out the seals.

And because of the desire of the United States to protect approaches to the Pribylov Islands from them, a serious conflict arose in Anglo-American relations. And in 1881, the Yankees announced the establishment of control over a part of the Bering Sea east of the maritime border with Russia. And from 1886 they began to seize fishing Canadian vessels.

Somehow I already complained, but - I repeat: it's a pity that only the "great classics" of the neomodern type Viktor Erofeev allowed unprintable expressions on printed pages!

However, I can hardly restrain myself here ... Well, really - the same Yankees that I met in bayonets Decree of September 4, 1821 ...

Oh yes, I hope the reader who remembers all the "conventional" collisions of the 20s of the 19th century will understand me without further explanation! And, perhaps, a male reader, at the news of such a "feint" of the Yankees in the years

The 80s, not constrained by self-censorship, will nevertheless take the soul away in certain verbal constructions ...

But this is all just a hint. And the saying was not for a fairy tale, but for a sad one ...

On March 2, 1889, the US Congress grants US President Grover Cleveland the authority to secure US exclusive rights in the Bering Sea!

And on January 22, 1890, James Gillespie Blain, an expansionist and staunch supporter of establishing US jurisdiction over the entire Bering Sea, Secretary of State in the expansionist administration and a staunch supporter of establishing US jurisdiction over the entire Bering Sea of President Benjamin Harrison, in a note of Great Britain declares the Bering Sea "closed by the sea"...

Closed!!!!

And after all this, historians like Bolkhovitinov dare to present the history of Russian America in the tone of some kind of Olympic academicism, and not in the tones of legitimate historical indignation and indignation of the Russian people at the behavior of the Yankees throughout this history, and later?

But if the Russians allowed themselves to be mocked, the British were tougher. They didn't even want to let the Yankees get away with the seizure of poachers, and even more so such a radical change in the legal status of the Bering Sea! And it all ended with the signing of a temporary agreement on joint patrols in the eastern sector of the ships of the United States and England (and later the Yankees also had to pay 473,151 dollars for illegal seizures of ships).

Still - after all, only Russia - until the spring of 1867 - had the right to the Bering Sea as internal, since it owned both its shores, both Asian and American.

Now it was already a joint possession of Russia and the United States. And in its western sector, the seals were guarded jointly by Americans and Russians. But even here there was a nuance ... In our sector, for Russian subjects (as well as for others), fishing was sharply limited, almost prohibited. But the seals were still exterminated - Canadian, American, and now also Japanese fishermen.

And if in 1888 we got 47,362 seals, then in 1898 - only 13,177. Of course, the richest trades were no longer ours. But in general, the "fur" value of the Pacific islands decreased.

So why were the Americans so tough on the status of the Bering Sea? I don't think it was just about the seals... The seals were pretty beaten out, though. True, there were still whales and fish ... However, in the future, a new concept came to the fore - geopolitics.

And, perhaps, it was from the standpoint of geopolitics that all these blans and johnsons pursued their "Bering" policy. And all the fuss around the Bering Sea was a political probe of world sentiment - and how will the outside world react to such a completely shameless arrogance of the United States?

But even the arrogant Yankees failed to turn the Bering Sea into an inland one. For this they lacked "small" - possession of the northern Asian coast of this sea!

But Russia at one time had this sea "both ends" and, accordingly, had the right to what the Yankees were deprived of their natural right.

YES, POLITICIANS and political thinkers from different countries already talked in the 19th century about the influence and mutual influence on the fate of countries and peoples of geographical, economic, anthropological factors ...

But what about in Russia?

Well, they thought about it in Russia too ... And sometimes even people who almost sat on

throne and, in any case, who were with the kings on a short and equal leg ...

In 1893, the twenty-seven-year-old cousin of Alexander III and uncle of Nicholas II, Grand Duke Alexander Mikhailovich, "Sandro", first came to America. He arrived on an official visit to thank President Cleveland for the assistance provided by the United States to Russia during

crop failure.

Well, thanks!

The States made a vivid impression on the young Grand Duke, and rightfully so. They knew how to work in the USA, although - this is not very well known - for a long time industrial America did not raise their hands natural Yankees, and immigrants, Italians par excellence.

And the Grand Duke wrote:

This is how even the Russian Grand Duke could think (but only think) ... True, he never thought of the idea that Russia did not need to be "Americanized" in order for it to powerfully move forward. It just had to be "Russianized", giving the best forces of Russia and the best

qualities of the Russian national character.

For the first time in Russian history, this was done in full measure by non-crowned relatives of the august dreamer, and the Bolsheviks Lenin and Stalin ...

Already in exile, this was understood and recognized by the Grand Duke himself, who wrote in 1932 that deeply hurt my soul line at the end of my memoirs:

"We must love Russia and the Russian people. This love of ours must be expressed in the desire to understand the new worldview of the Russian people ... We must find in this new worldview those aspects that can be perceived by us.

The principle put into practice: "The work of everyone in the name of the good of the state" is quite acceptable for each of us; it will serve as the link that will connect us, the representatives of old Russia, with the people Russia new ... "

And while in Russia, a bunch of anti-national bastards, deeply indifferent to the fate of their own nurtured country, over and over again turned out to be able to completely change the entire geopolitical perspective of both their homeland and the whole world...

Someone understood this even then, someone understood it later, and someone did not understand it even by the beginning of the 21st century ...

Chapter 12

The history of Wrangel Island as a mirror of Anglo-Saxon politics...

And WE, in the new century that began so mediocre for Russia and the whole world, need to know something about the centuries of the past ... Therefore, further it will be quite appropriate to talk about some circumstances that arose a few decades after Russia lost its part of America and - in many respects - as a result of this loss. So we will trace a certain history of a certain multi-way discovery up to the 20s of the XX century, that is, until the time of Soviet Russia ...

And this story with geography will additionally shed light on the fact that with the Anglo-Saxons Russia could only have such partnerships as are at the card table between honest players and cheaters. In this case, *the partners* in the game are also sitting at the table. However, their goals and objectives are opposite...

With Japan, with China, under certain conditions, we could have been *partners-allies* in ancient times . But with the Anglo-Saxons, this was impossible. And if they could not treat tsarist Russia with respect, then, all the more so, they could not be friendly to the new, Soviet Russia.

Two Anglo-Saxon powers were present in the North Pacific in the 20th century. The one with which we bordered on the Yukon until 1867, and the one with which we bordered across the Bering Strait after 1867. This, of course, is about the English dominion of Canada and the United States.

And here one detail was woven into the matter, curled with a rope since tsarist times - the story of the island named after the "Russian American" Ferdinand Petrovich Wrangel. And with this story, perhaps, it is necessary to acquaint the reader in detail ...

In 1946, Leonid Mikhailovich Starokadomsky expounded it well in his book on polar voyages, and what I tell you further is largely based on his information. As, however, and on information from a number of other sources. Moreover, everything here turned out to be so interesting that I decided, in the end, to devote a separate small chapter to Wrangel Island and give it the name that the reader

read above.

And the author hopes that after getting acquainted with the introduction of this story into the narrative written below the reader will not be disappointed.

And in order to deal with Wrangel Island, we will have to go back to the time of Sarychev and even earlier. And, examining the situation around the Russian polar island, one can once again be convinced that today and even tomorrow are connected with long-standing events much more firmly and relevantly than it seems to a superficial glance!

So, Wrangel Island ...

Starokadomsky wrote: "Now *Wrangel Island is a habitable and populated place, one of the outposts of Soviet culture in the Far North. Fisheries are developed on the island, there is a permanent radio weather station ...*

And ... in 1911 (when an icebreaking transport approached the Wrangel for cartographic surveys

"Vaigach". - S.K.) *Wrangel Island was a truly white spot. It was uninhabited, inaccessible, almost completely unknown.*

*Few managed to approach the shores of the mysterious land, lost in the icy expanses.
The path to it was blocked by heavy, impenetrable ice.*

Yes, with a length of 109 kilometers and a width of about 30, this island is more than a hundred kilometers north of the mainland, separating the Chukchi and East Siberian seas.

The Chukchi have known about this mysterious land (the only one in the boundless ice fields there) since ancient times. From the Chukchi, Russians also knew about it - at least since 1644. The explorer Ivan Lvov reported about it at the beginning of the 18th century - according to others.

Later, Sergeant Stepan Andreev, who traveled around Chukotka with a "Cossack from Chukchi" by Nikolai Daurkin. And - also from other people's words.

Lomonosov mapped the land discovered at the tip of his tongue as a vast land that continued towards America and, possibly, merged with it. He gave the presumed "earth"-island the prophetic name "Doubtful"...

Observing the fluctuations of the sea at the Baranov stone, the conclusion about the existence of a large island to the north of the Chukotka Peninsula (or "mother land") was made in July 1787 by Gavriil Sarychev. Sarychev was supported in this by his companion, Captain Timofei Shmalev, known to us, who *"heard from the Chukchi about the hardened land lying ... not far from the Shelagsky nose (the western tip of the Chaunskaya Bay. - S.K.), that it is inhabited and that the Shelagsky Chukchi in winter sometimes in one day move there over the ice on deer.*

In 1820, the Kolyma detachment was formed to survey the shores of the northeast of Siberia, led by Lieutenant Ferdinand Wrangel. Midshipman Fyodor Matyushkin became his assistant. Subsequently, both wore admiral's epaulettes.

Fedor Fedorovich Matyushkin is Pushkin's lyceum friend, and the name of his Russian heart is familiar and close. He had been friends with Wrangel since the joint round-the-world voyage on the sloop Kamchatka in 1817-1819 to the shores of Russian America.

Captain Vasily Golovnin, who lived according to the motto "Duty, honor, justice", took only officers personally known to him on the sloop, and he ignored the request of the commander of the Revel port to include midshipman Wrangel in the Kamchatka team.

Then the midshipman filed a report on his illness to his superiors, and he himself went to St. Petersburg, to Golovnin - to ask to sail at least as a simple sailor. As a result, Golovnin took him as a junior watch officer. AND

did not regret it.

Now Wrangel was already selecting people for himself, and there were a handful of them, but - consonant with the word "cohort". Matyushkin, navigator Kozmin, doctor of medicine Cyber, sailors Ivaninkov and Nekhoroshkov - with excellent artisan hands...

Having reached the original base, the detachment began the long and exhausting survey work. And in December 1820, Matyushkin, in a conversation with the Chukchi Valetka at a fair in the village of Ostrovnoy, heard from him about a large, mountainous and inhabited island to the north of Cape Shelagsky. Valetka even drew it in the snow. There is a record of Matyushkin about this dated November 3, 1822.

And on March 19, 1823, Wrangel himself, from the words of a kamakai (foreman) of the Chukchi, wrote that *"on clear summer days, high, snow-covered mountains are visible in the north, across the sea, but in winter, however, they are not it is seen"...*

The attempt to get there failed. Nevertheless, in his work "Journey along the northern shores of Siberia and the Arctic Sea, made in 1820, 1821, 1822, 1823 and 1824 by an expedition under the command of the fleet of Lieutenant F.P. Wrangel", published in 1841, Wrangel pointed to this "unknown land" directly to the north of the small Cape Yakan between Chaun Bay and Cape Ir-Karpiy (Cape Schmidt). On the map there was a circle and the inscription: *"Mountains are seen from Cape Yakan in the summer."* And Wrangel determined the location of the island of his name quite accurately.

Russian experts knew about the discoveries of the Wrangel-Matyushkin expedition, of course, long before the publication of its report. The twenty-five-year-old staff captain of the Guards General Staff, the Decembrist Alexander Osipovich Kornilovich, nine months before participating in the "December case", published an article in February 1825 in No. 4 of the journal "Northern Archive" where it was said:

"The obstacles set by nature did not allow Wrangel to verify with his own eyes the existence of the land, which, according to the Chukchi, lies north of Cape Yakan, but he prepared for his successor in this matter all the ways to discover it. He pointed out the place from where he should look for her, and the ways how it is more convenient to reach her."

Kornilovich was absolutely right! But with the "successors" there was some discrepancy ...
Civilized sailors appeared

lived in these icy waters only 26 years after Wrangel. And they appeared on the American ship "Herald" under the command of Captain Kellet. Starokadomsky calls him like this: "One of the American intelligence officers who penetrated Russian waters under the pretext of searching for the lost expedition of Franklin."

It is difficult for me to refute Leonid Mikhailovich's assessment - I myself think so. The English expedition of sixty-year-old Arctic veteran John Franklin set out in 1845 from London in search of the Northwest Passage and passed Greenland into the Baffin Sea and on to Lancaster Sound, where they got lost. Before the Bering Strait, she still had to wind and wind in the hodgepodge of the northern Canadian islands. And looking for Franklin beyond Chukotka meant going from Moscow to Leningrad via Baku.

And Captain Kellet probably just followed the path of Captain Cook and with the same goals - to collect information about the current situation in the Russian North beyond the Bering Strait.

Kellet only saw the land behind the ice, but, unlike Wrangel, he immediately named it Kellet Land ("land" in the Arctic was called land, which, due to uncertainty, was not risked as an island). He called a small island nearby Gerald (this name stuck with him).

In 1855, one of the routes of the American Rogers-Ringold expedition on the ship Vincent passed in the area of the island. Talking about Russian America, I already somehow mentioned Commodore John Rogers, who devoted many years to the study of the Pacific North.

Considering that at that time this north was exclusively Russian, and taking into account Rogers' interest also to the north beyond the Bering Strait and in the direction along Chukotka, then it is possible in Rogers consider scout.

The next here was also the Yankees - the captain of the commercial whaling schooner "Nile" Thomas Long. Again, Starokadomsky, rightly calling Long "an American predator," writes that *"Long did not land on the shore, as he was engaged in a more profitable business - the extermination of whales in foreign Russian waters - and he had no time for discoveries. But Long called this land the name of Wrangel, because he knew that Wrangel was the first to give reliable information about it."*

Even here it is difficult for me to disagree with the old Russian polar explorer. I will only add that later the strait between the island and the continent was named after Long. And it would be necessary - in the name of Matyushkin, actually.

But - one to one, and the Yankees - to the Yankees! And for the third time the Americans came here again! There seemed to be no smeared with honey - the climate is not the same. But, for something they were drawn here ...

But the third route to Wrangel Island, perhaps, clarifies something. Moreover, since what is stated below is my personal reconstruction in the evaluation part, I will dwell separately on this third (and related fourth) voyage of the "sons of freedom" to the Russian shores ...

In 1879, the motor-sailing schooner Jeannette left San Francisco under the command of US Navy officer George Washington De-Long (he has nothing to do with Thomas Long). She was equipped allegedly at the expense of the publisher of the New York Herald Bennett. And equipped allegedly with the aim of reaching the North Pole - for advertising.

As far as I know, De Long's expedition was the only one that intended to "take" the North Pole through the Bering Strait. All the rest went through other, more rational (or rather, the only rational) Arctic zones. There is even such a concept - "the American way to the North Pole." This is the traditional direction for the Yankees through the straits between Greenland and Ellesmere Island, along which the routes of the American expeditions of Kane, Hayes, Hall, and the Nares expedition were laid.

Piri, Sverdrup, Frederick Cook also followed fairly close paths...

Why, Ferdinand Petrovich Wrangel, in his work "On the Means of Reaching the Pole," published in 1849 in the Notes of the Russian Geographical Society, wrote:

"My opinion is as follows: the expedition ship will winter near the Eskimo village near the latitude 77 ° off the western coast of Greenland ... When the waters freeze, in the fall, the expedition should begin reconnaissance to the north, moving to Smith Sound, and from there further north ... The detachment would have to , thus, drive to the pole ... and back about 1800 miles in a straight line direction..."

But De-Long allegedly expected that the sea current from the Bering Sea would carry him to the pole strait!

To be honest, I want to shrug my shoulders, although you will find such an explanation in the most reputable sources. As if the Arctic (the name itself speaks for itself!) The ocean is the tropics.

True, there are warm currents in the Bering Strait, but how much do you need to think to understand that you won't even "get close" to the Pole because they must inevitably be squeezed out by pack ice to the Asian and American continents. They, of course, do push-ups - to the right and left.

And already this "leaky" feature of the expedition turns out to be inexplicable, if one does not make a natural assumption about, again, purely reconnaissance tasks of De Long. The Yankees had not yet invented "non-governmental" funds, so they had to hide behind a newspaperman Bennett.

But this is how the De Long expedition is assessed by the author, not by historians. And this surprises the author. After all, the story of De Long's wanderings is a trick within a trick covered by a trick (here I used the terminology of the author of the fantastic Dune saga, Frank Herbert).

Let's see which way this "conqueror of the pole" went ... And at the same time, we take into account that in addition to the supposedly "conquering the pole", which in itself was a grandiose and difficult task, De Long allegedly still had to "find" the Nordenskiöld expedition that did not disappear anywhere.

Swedish polar explorer Nils Adolf Erik Nordenskiöld began his career in

Russian sector of the Arctic in 1875. He was born and studied in the then Russian Helsingfors (Helsinki), spoke Russian well. Explored Svalbard and Greenland. He was attracted to the problem of the Russian North by an outstanding commercial and industrial figure in Siberia - a European-educated gold miner Alexander Mikhailovich Sibiryakov (here we must also mention another pioneer - industrialist Mikhail Konstantinovich Sidorov).

In 1878-1879 Nordenskiöld, financed by Sibiryakov and the Swedish merchant Oscar Dixon, first passed the Northeast Passage from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean on the ship Vega, with one wintering in the Chukotka Kolyuchinskaya Bay. That is, it completely passed through the Northern Sea Route, which was previously mastered by Russian sailors only in parts. Two auxiliary Sibiryakovsky vessels accompanied the "Run" made of oak to the mouth of the Yenisei, and one to the mouth of the Lena. The Vega, delayed by wintering, on July 18, 1879, freed itself from the ice, went out into clean water, and in September safely arrived in Japanese Yokohama.

Special problems due to the good training of Nordenskiöld and Captain "Run" Arnold

There was no Palander from Gothenburg. So why are the Yankees suddenly worried about the fate of the Swedes?

I think they did not care about them - as at that time and to the pole. But before the Northern Sea Route and the Russian North, they had a thing to do! Here they were interested in many things. Or rather, everything! And the fact that the reader and I already know about this interest of the Anglo-Saxons allows us to see in De Long just another trusted intelligence officer, the heir to James Cook!

De Long's "Jeanette" left San Francisco on July 8, 1879, and already on September 5 she froze into ice off Herald Island. Yes, the current carried her to Gerald, but she could not bear it anywhere else. And then began a 21-month drift along the Russian Siberian coast to the New Siberian Islands, an accurate map of which was made by Pyotr Fedorovich Anzhu, who worked in 1820-1824 in parallel with Wrangel, but to the west. By the way, Jules Verne wrote about the Anjou expedition in his "History of Great Journeys", where he also spoke about the Wrangel expedition, noting that he "collected legends and valuable information about the existence of the land located abeam Cape Yakan".

Despite a purely French surname (his grandfather was a native of France), the lieutenant, and later the admiral of the Russian fleet, Anzhu, was born in Vyshny Volochek, Tver province. In 1820, he was appointed head of the Ustyansk expedition and discovered and described everything more or less significant in the area of the Novosibirsk archipelago. De Long, while drifting, stumbled upon small islands, which he named Jeanette and Henriette.

Actually, the New Siberian Islands were discovered by the Russians a long time ago. So, one of their groups is called Lyakhovsky by the name of the Yakut merchant-manufacturer Ivan Lyakhov, who discovered them in 1770. And they were named so by decree of Catherine the Great.

One curious thing is connected with the name of the island Kotelný from this group - a copper boiler was forgotten on the island, which is why it became Kotelný. This is how it sometimes happens in history with geography.

So De-Long here was not so much discovering something as *he was scouting*. However, on June 13, 1881, Jeannette was crushed by ice. And, already drifting on an ice floe, on July 27 the Americans discovered the island, which received the name of Bennett (all three islands make up the De Long group).

Freed from the ice, the surviving expedition either on two or three boats (there is a discrepancy in the sources) headed for the mouth of the Lena, but De Long's own group of 19 people died of starvation. And another group of 13 people, led by chief engineer J. W. Melville, was rescued by the Yakuts (Melville in March 1882 and found De Long's camp and his diary).

The Russian authorities, at the request of the State Department, assisted in every possible way both the expedition and its

searches. Well, the dramas and tragedies of mankind make us forget about tricks within tricks.

But how much better, smarter life would be on the planet if humanity would put these cunning tricks into the archive of history along with the relationships that give rise to these tricks. In the Russian Novosibirsk archipelago, two groups of islands bear French names, but how different are the fates of their carriers! Anjou honestly served Russia, but De Long ... Even the fact that he was pretentiously named George Washington at birth, one can guess the hereditary Masonic ancestry ... Sooner or later we would have discovered the group of islands "his name" ourselves ... And was it really worth it to help to American fans of "search for missing expeditions" in their reconnaissance searches in the Russian Arctic? Then, you look, and they wouldn't have to - what can you do - save them.

In addition, in 1881, in the Arctic Ocean, the Yankees sailed not only on an ice floe, but also on two steamers. Lieutenant Berry commanded the Rogers and the entire expedition, and Captain Hooper commanded the Corvin. They were now looking for De-Long, but, as Starokadomsky writes, "they did not miss the opportunity to rummage in foreign waters, to explore the limits of the Russian land."

With the intuition of a real Russian Soviet man, Leonid Mikhailovich Starokadomsky caught the double meaning of this expedition as well - there was a reconnaissance moment here. No wonder Berry and Rogers went to Wrangel Island, clearly knowing that it was there, and not to the pole, that De Long was going. Yes, and the name of the flagship - "Rogers", was given, presumably, in honor of Commodore Scout John Rogers.

And in August 1881, the foot of a "civilized" person, Captain Hooper, finally set foot on the eastern shore of Wrangel Island. By that time, the Washington Treaty of 1867 had already existed for thirteen years, which clearly stated that from the starting point in the Bering Strait, "the western border of the ceded territories (former Russian America. - S.K.) ... is directed in a straight line boundlessly to the north, until it is not lost at all in the Arctic Ocean.

For all the illiteracy of the wording, it followed from it that the demarcation between the possessions of Russia and the United States goes in a straight line to the North Pole. Hooper, however, raised the Stars and Stripes banner over the island, "named" the land "New Columbia" and declared it an American possession. The ship of the gallant captain was called "Korvin", which means "Raven" ... Well, the name of the essence corresponded - over the island in Russian waters, the crows, greedy for darmovshchina, once again circled ...

However, Berry, who approached Wrangel two weeks later on the Rogers, did not approve of all this and left behind the island its former name.

But in history, Hooper "marked himself." And to this day it has not been forgotten. And his provocation was only an adage to the events of the 20th century.

In the middle of September 1911, the Vaigach approached Wrangel Island under the command of K.V. Loman (a brave and decisive officer, who died a heroic death in the First World War shortly after the expedition).

And the flag of the country was raised over Wrangel Island, the only one to which this island could belong! I look at an old photograph: an old Russian flag in the center of a small, freshly mounded mound in the snow, and next to it are six Russian sailors. "Vaigach" surveyed the island, made hydrobiological stations, put up the first nautical sign and determined the first astronomical point on the island. It turned out, by the way, that the island is located in three hemispheres at once - the Northern, as well as in the Western and Eastern. It turns out so because it lies on the 180th degree of longitude, on the meridian opposite to the "zero", Greenwich.

Even wild animals did not remember the stay of the Americans here once. Arctic foxes not frightened by anyone

allowed people to approach them for 6-7 steps.

Upon completion of the work of the Hydrographic Expedition of the Arctic Ocean, the Russian Foreign Ministry on September 11, 1916 sent a note to foreign powers, where it reported on new Russian discoveries and emphasized: "The island of General Vilkitsky, the Land of Emperor Nicholas II, the island of Tsarevich Alexei, the islands: Starokadomsky, Novopashenny, Henrietta, Jeanettes, Bennepa, Herald and Solitude... together with the islands of New Siberia, Wrangel and others, located off the Asian coast of Russia, form an inseparable part of the Russian state."

The need for this note, which pointed to the outside world at, in general, the obvious, was caused by circumstances related to yet another (and - not the last!) Anglo-Saxon expedition!

Well, what can you say!

IT WAS SO ... In 1913, the Canadian government organized an expedition to explore the Arctic regions adjacent to Canada in the Beaufort Sea, west of the Parry archipelago. The expedition was led by Viljalmur Stefanson.

And some of the signs of this expedition are also so strange, and the historians of the issue have so unanimously paid no attention to them, that at least we will look at them, dear reader!

Stefanson was no stranger to the Arctic. Born in 1879, he began ethnographic and archaeological research in Iceland at the age of twenty-five. Then he was in the north of Alaska and in the Arctic zone of Canada.

It seems to be not a geographer, not a hydrographer, not a sailor ... Nevertheless, the leadership of a seemingly purely geographical expedition aimed at discovering new possible islands in the Beaufort Sea is entrusted to him.

The ships of the Arctic (!) State (!!) expedition included the schooner "Karluk", not designed (according to sources) for navigation in ice.

Further, events developed (or allegedly developed) as follows ... An undoubted fact is the passage of the Karluk into the Arctic Ocean through the Bering Strait in the last days of July 1913. At this time of the year, sailing conditions are most favorable there. Let us recall that on July 18, 1879, Nordenskiöld's Vega completely froze out of the ice in the Kolyuchinskaya Bay.

But "Karluk" was allegedly surrounded by floating ice, and she began to allegedly drift east in the direction Alaskan Cape Barrow.

Strange! Two warm currents pass through the Bering Strait. The one that turns to the west behind the strait is more powerful, besides, the rotation of the Earth helps it, and it pushes the border of floating ice so that a rather elongated "tongue" is formed in this border in the direction to the northwest. But it does not touch the Kolyuchinskaya Bay - the ice conditions there are not easy. Nevertheless, Nordenskiöld was released from it in mid-July.

The eastern warm Zaberger current is less powerful, and the boundary of floating ice moves away from the Alaskan coast to a lesser extent. However, the width of the passage is about fifty kilometers - there is where to go, especially in late July - early August in the presence of a coastal warm current.

And the "Karluk" suddenly "drifted" ... I repeat - strange ...

It was also strange that the head of the expedition himself was on such a "frivolous" ship. But on September 20, he "suddenly" decides to go along with three members of the expedition and two Eskimos

ten days on land - supposedly "to hunt."

September is already a dangerous, stormy period. However, Stefanson leaves the ship without hesitation, although returning to it is more than problematic. He never returned. And the Karluk, in full accordance with the laws of Arctic drifts, began to move west - towards Wrangel Island. Stefanson, with his companions, soon went to inhabited places on the mainland.

So, the expedition lost its "full-time" leader. But there was no anxiety and panic, since Captain Robert Barlett became the commander of the Karluk. He was a member of Robert Peary's last two expeditions to the North Pole and was nicknamed "Ice Bean". On the polar expedition of 1908-1909, he commanded the Piri ship "Roosevelt" and wintered in the Arctic for the fourth year.

So Stefanson's "hunt" in the light of this looks like just an excuse for a planned transfer of powers. Barlett was an experienced professional polar explorer, while Stefanson was more of a geopolitical intelligence professional. And his next moves were to be carried out now in the "civilized" world.

Barlett drifted on the Karluk until January 11, 1914, after which (according to his version) the ship cracked, and the crew - again without panic - descended onto the ice floe. And descended - by a strange (!) Coincidence (?) - near the place where De Long's Jeannette was previously blocked by ice. Moreover, the entire expeditionary cargo was calmly unloaded onto the ice floe: food, clothes, tools, sledges, boats ... In the ice camp they set up a tent, a box house, built a large snow hut. In short - the "victims" settled down with all the amenities.

Barlett then recounted his adventures in the following sequence. In total, 25 people landed on the ice. Ten days later, on the eve of the polar day, a sleigh party of 7 people (including one Norwegian and two Eskimos) on three sledges was sent to Wrangel Island. The rest started prepare to land.

On February 13, the Norwegian and the Eskimos returned to the camp and reported that the rest remained at the polynya 3 miles from Gerald.

On February 14, the new four most impatient left on foot. Further - the matter is dark, because both the first four died without reaching the goal. Although the four remaining at the hole had two whole sledges.

But the other two fours with dog teams that left on February 19 (one team per group) reached Wrangel safely, as did the last batch of seven people led by Barlett himself. She left the camp on February 24, and included an Eskimo woman with two children (please pay special attention to the presence of children!).

March 12 "Ice Bob" reached the Ice Spit on the northeastern side of Wrangel Island. And already on March 18, together with the Eskimo Kataktovik, on a team with seven dogs, he moved through the Long Strait to the mainland - for help. Those remaining were instructed to assemble by mid-July on the south shore at Rogers Harbor.

After 17 days of travel, Barlett reached the Siberian coast to the west of Cape Severny (Schmidt), and then from one Chukchi village to another reached the Kolyuchinskaya Bay. And there he met the head of the Chukotka district.

And at the end of May, the captain was already in Alaska in St. Michael (as we know, the Yankees renamed St. Michael the former Russian village of Mikhailovskoye, founded just at the direction of the ruler of the Russian colonies in America, Wrangel, by his subordinate Tebenkov). And from the ex-Mikhailovsky Barlett sent

to the Maritime Administration of Canada, a lengthy telegraph report, where he reported, in particular, this is what:

Then Barlett moved to the Alaskan port of Nome on the Seward Peninsula (Yankee memory "Conqueror" of Alaska was noted on it more than once).

The awareness of "Ice Bob" who had just returned from the polar ice desert is not amazing. She doesn't even bother me.

She convinces me!

Convinces that the case with this "expedition in the Beaufort Sea" was oh, how unclear!

Our icebreaking transports really wintered in Vladivostok and were preparing for serious scientific research in the navigation of 1914. And instead, the Hydrographic Department informed the new head of the expedition, Vilkitsky (son of the famous Andrey Ippolitovich Vilkitsky, who died in the post of head of the Hydrographic Department in 1913), that the Canadian government turned to the Russian for help and that he should try to approach Wrangel Island and remove the "Canadians".

July 7, 1914 "Taimyr" and "Vaigach" left the Golden Horn Bay through the Sangar Strait to Kamchatka and beyond. On July 28, they entered Providence Bay in Chukotka and anchored in Emma Bay. There they were already waiting for a huge transport "Tobol" with a load of fuel and water.

Having crossed to Nome, our sailors learned that Barlett had already gone north on the cruiser Baer. And also went to Wrangel ...

Neither the Russian icebreakers nor the "Ber" could approach the island - the ice interfered. The Vaigach was crushed, one propeller blade broke off. August attempts ended in nothing. People - five Eskimos and nine whites - were taken off in September by the American steam schooner King and Wing ... Three whites died on the island.

I TOLD the story of "Karluk" in detail and, I hope, close to the truth.

And now I ask the reader: "But doesn't it look like a daring, bold — I don't argue, but clearly a reconnaissance raid into the eastern zone of the Russian Arctic?" He didn't go quite the way he was obviously supposed to, and had to ask for help. But here's how it happened. The Arctic is the Arctic!

Even the experienced Starokadomsky did not see anything suspicious in what happened, which is quite understandable. Firstly, he was a doctor, not a counterintelligence officer, and secondly, this story was very close to him humanly - after all, he and his comrades were in a hurry to help, worried about failures, thought that people were dying of hunger. But today we need to look at this whole story with an impartial and testing...

It would be possible, of course, to attribute all these "cases" with the missing and injured Anglo-Saxon expeditions to the complexity of the Arctic situation, if not for a whole series of provocations around Wrangel Island, started by the Yankees Kellet and Hooper in the 19th century and continued by the Anglo-Saxons in the 20th century.

The 20th century series was opened by Stefanson. As a result of his expedition, the Canadian government, already during the First World War, arranged some fuss around Wrangel Island - which is why the tsarist government had to resort to notification in 1916 to the "allied and friendly (ha! - S.K.) powers."

Stefanson did not calm down even after the Great October Socialist Revolution. But even before Before I talk about it, I will note this ...

I don't know how anyone, but it seems to me that the Karluk was chosen precisely for its inability to sail on ice. And his route was immediately planned in one direction - only "there" ... And - not in the Beaufort Sea, but in the Chukchi Sea.

Let's think about why on board the expedition ship it was necessary to have - among the six Eskimos - an Eskimo family with children? Is it not to try to settle them on Wrangel, and if successful, expand the colony, strengthening Canada's claims to the previously deserted island with the precedent of "first settlement"?

I have reasons to believe so, because Stefanson's behavior itself gives them. In 1920, he sent a message to Canadian Prime Minister A. Meigan with a proposal to declare Wrangel Island Canadian, since "Russia is engulfed in civil war and has no time to deal with its outskirts." While Megan was thinking, Stefanson created the "Arctic Exploration and Development Company", and in 1921 a Canadian-American expedition of twenty-two-year-old Allen Crawford was sent to the "doubtful" island.

There was a connection between Crawford and Stefanson, because the latter again turned to the government of the now Prime Minister Mackenzie King, calling for "bringing a state basis under private initiative." And in May 1922, King proclaims in Parliament the accession of Wrangel Island to Canada (Crawford himself drew up a declaration on the entry of the island into the UK).

And on May 24, the government of the RSFSR sends the first protest to Great Britain about Stefanson's actions. Mr. Villalmur was, of course, only a screen here, but a convenient, effective screen. It was easy to hide behind him. They hid behind him...

Comedy, however, soon acquired a shade of tragedy, because the new "colonists" did not work out. And in 1923, when the schooner of Captain Noyce "Donaldson" approached Wrangel, alive there was only one person left.

G. Voitlovsky, the author of a very good article "On Different Sides of the Bering Strait", published in the June issue of the journal "World Economy and International Relations" for 1986, notes in this regard that if, they say, Crawford's companions looked into the published 10 years before Stefanson's adventure, the Encyclopædia Britannica, where it was quite definitely said that Wrangel belonged to Russia, then some of them could survive "to this day" ...

But it's not so simple! What are the youngsters - in the "Britannica", it turns out that the government did not look either King, and the Russian Foreign Ministry?

Yes, and the English Foreign Office somehow responded only to our third protest, and finally England declared that she did not claim any rights to Wrangel Island, only on August 6, 1924.

But by that time, the Yankees were claiming it. The American company Loman Brothers, a businessman from Alaska, Karl Loman, sends vessels German, Baer, Silver Wave to the island and throws industrialists there. A map is published on which Wrangel is painted in the colors of the United States and named "New Columbia".

However, Soviet Russia was already getting stronger, and in July 1924, the gunboat Krasny Oktyabr, which left Vladivostok, headed for Wrangel Island under the command of the former commander of the Taimyr, forty-year-old Boris Vladimirovich Davydov.

An excellent sailor, he fought in the Russo-Japanese War, in 1906 he entered the hydrographic department of the Naval Academy, in 1910 he commanded the Taimyr, and in 1913 he became the head of the Hydrographic Expedition of the Pacific Ocean.

During the years of intervention, he prepared the capital work "Pilot of the coasts of the RSFSR of the Sea of Okhotsk and the Eastern coast of the Kamchatka peninsula, including the island of Karaginsky", published in Vladivostok in 1923. With the establishment of Soviet power in the Far East, Davydov was appointed head of the Directorate for ensuring the safety of navigation, and in 1924 again went to the polar island, off the coast of which he visited in 1911.

On August 19, the Soviet flag was raised over Wrangel for the first time, and Lomen's industrialists were Davydov removed from the island.

October 23 "Red October" returned to the Golden Horn Bay.

And on November 4, 1924, the government of the RSFSR sent a memorandum to the Secretary of State USA with confirmation of the notification of 1916 - including according to Wrangel and Herald.

The ice campaign to Wrangel was the last for Boris Vladimirovich - in 1925 he died. Until some point, his fate was similar to the fate of Kolchak. Both were in Russian-Japanese, both were hydrographers. Davydov commanded "Taimyr", Kolchak at one time - "Vaigach". But Davydov served Russia to the end, and Kolchak ...

And Kolchak ended his life as a protege of the Yankees.

Well, to each his own...

HOWEVER, the Yankees were always sure that they were entitled to both their own and someone else's ... Having started in the Russian Arctic with "Lands of Kellet", they never learned that this part of the Arctic can only be Russian.

And they did not leave Wrangel Island alone, which makes it to this day a kind of mirror of America's long-term foreign policy towards Russia. But something extra about it I

I will tell the reader at the very end of the story - in the afterword.

Because there is a time for everything.

And on Wrangel Island, a new life was being established. On April 15, 1926, the decision of the Presidium of the Central Executive Committee of the USSR accurately fixed the boundaries of the Soviet polar possessions. And in August 1926, Captain Pavel Georgievich Milovzorov landed 60 settlers on Wrangel from the Stavropol steamer. They were mostly Eskimo hunters from Chukotka. The legendary Georgy Alekseevich Ushakov became the head of the island for three years, later describing in detail the Northern Earth.

In 1927, the Kolyma steamer with two seaplanes approached here. However, only planes hit the island itself. All the settlers were alive and well, but there were already one more of them - for account of "natural increase" ...

In 1931, the icebreaker Sibiryakov with the expedition of the Arctic Institute under the command of Otto Yulievich Schmidt made the first through voyage along the Northern Sea Route in one navigation, having traveled from Arkhangelsk to the Bering Strait in two months and three days ... And a period of turbulent times began for the Soviet Arctic. development.

And foreign policy storms at the junction of the subarctic zone of the Pacific Ocean and the Arctic Ocean subside.

However, only temporarily...

And so the reader needs to tell the story of Wrangel Island ...

In 1951, a book was published in Moscow with a not quite intelligible title "International Law, its understanding and application by the United States of America", by C.C. Hyde.

In fact, international law is called international because it is recognized, understood and applied by all countries *in the same way*.

Come on, just that ... But the book with a strange title reported that the United States - although it "never officially made any claims to open Arctic lands" - "did not give up its claims to Wrangel Island."

In 1951!

And the story doesn't end this year either. The fuss around the "expanding interpretation of the Treaty of 1867" in an effort to further profit in Soviet waters at the expense of Wrangel Island was arranged by the Yankees in 1977. And then the "island" theme was again procrastinated in the US press.

The time has come for the "perestroika" devil dance... And in 1990, Gorbachev and Shevardnadze finally interpreted the "agreement" as the Yankees should have. As a result, Russia has deprived itself - besides Russian America - of another 55,000 square kilometers of shelf in the Bering Sea.

However, the Yankees have not abandoned their claims to this day! Yes, and how! Today, US extremists directly reproach the Washington administration for not taking advantage of the victory in the Cold War and for ceding to Russia "an Arctic empire, including Wrangel Island and a group of smaller islands in the Arctic Ocean."

They really want to catch fish there, and explore for oil, and set up new bases. Former Russian Alaska, where they are now installing their missile defense systems, the Yankees are not enough!

Eh!

Academician Bolkhovitinov, who has been mentioned by me more than once, remarks melancholy about all this vile impudence and impudent meanness: Arctic Ocean..."

In the forty-first year, for such "reasoning" they put me up against the wall. Today they give grants. And it's good that it's not state awards - well, it contributes to de "mutual understanding" of two "friendly" countries. In any case, in the Russia of Alexander II, this academician of some White Eagle, you see, would have received it. After all, ideologically, it is no different from the glasses, Reuters and Crabbé that sold Russian America ...

However, what does it do? From the reasoning of the academician, it can be understood that the United States is no longer inclined to regard as valid a long-standing agreement on the cession of the Russian part of America and the Russian Pacific islands to them. But if that "treaty" absolutely capitulating on the part of Russia is not written to the United States, then maybe it is for the best?

Maybe then we ourselves have the right to demand "back" - in the future - the "Alyasochka land" with the islands, thievishly sold from the hands? Maybe it was not for nothing that Andrei Yanuaryevich Vyshinsky ordered that materials on Russian America be transferred to the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and not, say, the Academy of Sciences?

After all, not only history is for us, but the Planet itself! And I, my dear reader, am not joking here ... And Now let me explain what I mean...

CURRENT Russians are trying to plant a lot of stupid and rotten geopolitical ideas... In academic journals, they talk about the idea of some kind of Euro-Atlantic union along the "arc" Europe-Russia-America. Everything here is false and deceitful - starting with the fact that America needs only one Russia, which has gone into political and historical non-existence.

And what, one might ask, is the geopolitical "gap" that the "yellow" Far East falls into here?

A constructive and sustainable global geopolitical "arc" is possible. But it is possible only in the form of a Germanized Middle Europe, connected with the "yellow" Far East through the revived new allied Russia.

Hanging over the "Islamic" world "arc", this "arc" of a higher level will be able not to put pressure on the "Islamic" "arc", but to include it in the overall structure of a globally stable (that is, fair and just) world order.

On the contrary, no geopolitical construction that will be built on the principle of partnership between Russia (or anyone else) with the United States can be sustainable and fruitful.

America cannot organically be a factor of stabilization and cooperation, because systemically it has been separated from the rest of the world since the moment of its formation. It is separated from the rest of the world to this day!

And this geopolitical thesis has surprising (or maybe not so) geographical support. The fact is that the United States is separated from Asia and Russia not only by the Pacific Ocean, but also differently...

Yes, not to mention that the Yankees arrogantly separate themselves from the rest of humanity, and Russia's alliance with them is impossible for this reason alone, such an alliance is disgusting to our Planet itself!

Yes, the planet!

Vladimir Ivanovich Vernadsky believed that man and the Earth form a single system - the "noosphere", where the mind of Man and the elements of the Planet from some point in the development of mankind act almost on an equal footing. They act - without conflicting with each other, if a person acts reasonably, and entering into a conflict otherwise ...

How we behave in relation to each other and in relation to the Planet, I will not speak. Let me just remind you that the mysterious warm seasonal surface current off the coast of Ecuador and Peru - El Niño, which brings hurricanes with it every 5-7 years, destroying all life in the ocean, arose not so long ago ... Is this not one of the Planet's answers to our social folly?

So Planet...

Let's look at the "space" map of the world in the North Pacific. From space one can clearly see huge elongated depressions - "troughs", passing along the ocean floor and, as it were, separating one zone of the Earth from another, delimiting them.

Here is the arc of the Aleutian Islands. And from its outer edge, geologically **separating** the Aleuts from the American mainland, the Aleutian Trench stretches.

At its western end, it joins the Kuril-Kamchatka Trench, the Tuskarora. And the deepest Tuskarora **separates** the Kuriles from America, just as the Izu Ogasawara (Bonin) trench and the famous Mariana Trench **separate** Japan from America.

That is, the "yellow" Far East **is separated** from America by the Planet itself!

No more, but no less.

And it separates from America in general the entire northern part of the Pacific Ocean with all its islands. America is on *the other* side of the ocean trenches, and on *this side* are Japan, China, Korea ...

And Russia.

And on the same - on our, Russian side is, if you look closely and think about it, the former Russian America.

Like this.

And, maybe, if Russia and the Planet have a future, we will still remember the troubles of Andrey Yanuarievich? Impossible, by the way, without the instructions of Joseph Vissarionovich ...

After all, the "country land of Alyasochka" would not interfere with us. And the Planet, I repeat, is for us!

Not to mention history!

In any case, the precedents for the actual rejection of the treaty of 1867 were created and are being created by themselves
yankees.

Afterword

WELL, WHAT, my dear reader! This story is almost over, and our joint work with you ends. The author wrote the book, you, my reader, read it... Moreover, I, and - I hope you - thought about a lot. And now it remains for me to say little in the afterword ...

Although - how to say ... After all, now, knowing more than we knew, something can be thought about and more once! And, perhaps, it should be done.

So...

On the one hand, too much of what has been described is reminiscent of what is happening today. At the same time, many long-standing factors and phenomena have not exhausted themselves in the 21st century. Moreover, in the beginning of the new century, they receive their logical conclusion. For example, the process of growing betrayal of Russia's national interests by its ruling and fattening "elite". After all, this process is rooted in the activities of such anti-national figures as the Vorontsov brothers, Nesselrode and the like... Rasputin's Race became an intermediate stage of the process, and Putin's Russia became the final one.

On the other hand, we, who live within the limits of the Russians, are the heirs of both historical glory, and historical infamy of ancestors.

But there is one sad moment here ... They - whether it is otherwise - but lived in the space from the islands of Ezel and Dago (now called Saaremaa and Hiiumaa) to Cape Dezhnev and from the Central Asian hot Kushka to the polar islands of the Arctic.

Now Russian borders have unnaturally shrunk, and we, their descendants, are mediocrely losing all the geopolitical achievements of our predecessors. However, even they, these historical predecessors of ours, did not always cover themselves and Russia with glory. And they made a number of mediocre and inglorious mistakes.

So, whether we want it or not, we are the heirs of both smart, honest glory, and the stupid, vile infamy of our ancestors.

Glory should be proud, infamy should be remembered.

Glory should inspire, dishonor should teach.

Glory must be continued, infamy must be overcome.

The period of stability, due to the presence in the world of the mighty Russian Soviet state, is now in the past. And the world can gain new stability only when the importance of Russia is restored. And this is possible primarily due to the efforts of the triune Russian people and geopolitically kindred peoples, united in the Soviet Union.

However, this new stability is hardly possible without our correct policy in relations with the outside world. And our history should teach everyone

Does he teach?

Does history teach the peoples of Europe? After all, both of the most terrible, most destructive wars in world history took place on its enlightened land. And both were conceived in the name of America's power and carried out - including - and in the name of America's dominion over Europe.

It was already a long time ago. What about today?

And today the sky over the Crimean Kazantip Bay, over the ancient Hellenic-Slavic Kerch-

Panticapaeum-Korchevo, both day and night, the American military transport "Galaxy" cut through their contrails ... From Europe to Iraq, from Iraq to Europe along the "corridor" given by the Yankees by Kiev. I can't write "given by Ukraine", because the Ukraine of Taras Bulba and Khmel'nitsky, the Ukraine of Gogol and Taras Shevchenko, the Ukraine of Shchors and Maria Demchenko could only give these voyagers a volley
air defense systems "S-300".

The Yankees are flying over Russian soil in the same sky over the same Gulf of Azov, where Soviet navigators guidance learned to aim at the targets "MiG-23" and "MiG-25" ...

They also fly over the cracked concrete strips of the former 71st Bagerov test site of the Soviet Air Force near Kerch ... Strategic bombers Tu-16, Tu-95 took off from these "concrete", heading for the country's nuclear test sites ... Here but the aeroballistics of our first atomic bombs of the RDS series were worked out ... This abbreviation, which stood for "Jet engine" C ", was unofficially deciphered as follows:" Russia makes

herself"...

Yes Russia...

And Europe...

And - the FAR East ... Although it is the Far East, it is "ours"! However, now Western authors - and Anglo-Saxon primarily - write with gloating and hope that Russia is increasingly cutting itself off from its East. That a generation has already grown up in the Russian Far East that knows what and where is in China, in Japan, in Korea, in the USA, but has never seen Moscow and not really Moscow interested.

Nevertheless, the Far East is still "ours". And the Yankees are still looking across the ocean at Russia... They look with contempt, but still with fear.

What will be their and our future if Russia decides to remain Russia?

Think, think, my dear contemporary, my dear reader...

AND FURTHER - that's what ... I think, right now - when both the author and the reader are already wiser with knowledge many things and about many things - it is appropriate and useful to get acquainted with the assessments of the familiar Russian geopolitician Alexei Efimovich Vandam (Edrikhin), made at the beginning of the 20th century, but even today facing the future.

Quotes from Vandam will be extensive ... I decided so because Vandam deserves it, and because they are read in one breath, and because they contain thoughts that, in fact, have been "cross-cutting" for the whole of Russian history for a good three centuries ... Vandamme very accurately saw the interconnection of all aspects of the Far East-Pacific problem...

And here is what Alexey Efimovich wrote in his work "Our Position" in 1912:

How accurate is that! Already at the beginning of the 20th century, Vandam wrote about the "chessboard" of the Anglo-Saxons, and Zbigniew Brzezinski at the end of this century called his book: "The Grand Chessboard" ("Great Chessboard").

So that...

But then Vandam says even more true and bitter things: "... *The earth's surface is for them a kind of chessboard, and the peoples, carefully studied in their basic properties and in the spiritual qualities of their rulers, are living pieces and pawns, which they move with such a calculation, that their adversary, who sees in every pawn in front of him an independent enemy, in the end, is lost in bewilderment - how and when the fatal move was made, which led to*

losing the game..."

Having made this digression, Vandamme continues: *"We will now see this kind of art in actions Americans and British against ourselves.*

As soon as the news of new Russian discoveries in the Pacific Ocean spread throughout the civilized world, American whalers working off Kamchatka and in the Sea of Okhotsk reached out to the Amur Estuary and the Tatar Strait to observe our actions there. In neighboring Manchuria, the best of political intelligence officers appeared - missionaries. In the United States itself, political thought was busy clarifying the question of what significance the greatest of the basins of the globe, that is, the Pacific Ocean, can have for mankind in general and for North Americans in particular. First raised by the press, this question then passed to the Washington Senate, which, like the ancient Roman Senate and the English House of Lords, is composed of the most powerful heads, the so-called "builders of the state." Of the speeches delivered in this institution in 1852 on the Pacific question, the most remarkable in depth of knowledge and clairvoyance was the speech of New York State Senator William Seward ... "

Here's how it turns out! The Yankees kept a close eye on our actions and were gripped by growing anxiety and even panic about our possible great prospects in the Pacific. They constantly puzzled over how to deprive Russia of these prospects.

And Russian academics keep telling us that it was, they say, Russia that imposed its stale American possessions on the poor Yankees. And the kind, they say, Yankee "Syuord" decided - in the breadth of his soul - to respond to the racial request to help her out with money.

The significance of the further practical actions of the United States, their relationship with Russian activity on the Amur and with the problem of Russian America, Vandamme also understood with absolute precision:

As we know today, Japan was able to gain true independence in the future. But we must not forget that this was written in 1912, seven years after the Treaty of Portsmouth. However, in a systemic sense, Vandam was absolutely right, correctly pointing out the role of the Anglo-Saxons in pitting Russia and Japan.

I can only add something here, recalling that all the fuss and haste of the Americans with the purchase of Russian America was caused by their "Amur" concerns. It was necessary to undercut our geopolitical prospects before they became obvious even for the near-minded dignitary St. Petersburg.

However, Vandamme said this just superbly:

"Since the time of our dominance in the Pacific Ocean, the latter had only one meaning for us. For thousands of years, undisturbed nature has bred countless herds of sea cows, otters, lions, beavers, seals and other animals on it. This vast pasture, which brought us considerable income, required protection, which is why a warship was sent there from Kronstadt from time to time. But to start the Pacific fleet, as Shelekhov and Baranov persistently urged (let's not forget Rezanov. - S.K.), who pledged to give it an excellent parking lot in the Hawaiian Islands, was considered superfluous, because, in our opinion at that time, the Great Ocean was and ... should was to remain a dead and useless desert. But then the Anglo-Saxons came, took our pastures from us, and we retreated to Kamchatka. Then the same Anglo-Saxons went to China and began to break the windows and doors of our neighbor. At this noise, we went down to the Amur and, having removed the knapsack from our shoulders, sat down in anticipation of new events.

How much bitterness and truth in these words, as in those with which I am quoting Vandam
I finish:

"For a people endowed with practical sense, creative energy and enterprise (this is about you and me, dear reader, it is said about the Russian people. - S.K.), there is something abnormal in this and still ongoing wandering and indecision . It is clear that somewhere and sometime we lost our way, moved away from it far to the side and even lost our direction ... "

This was written before the Great October Revolution. By the time of the revolution, the Russian Empire, formally autocratic, was almost completely deprived of the opportunity to choose its own path on its own. And the main reason was the huge external debts that had been accumulating for more than a century. The reader knows that the practice of extensive external loans was already characteristic of the era of Catherine and Alexander the First ... And even then, these loans began to play the role not of shackling fetters, but the role of reins, pulling which the West knocked Russia off the right track.

Eastern wars of Nicholas the First of the late 20s of the XIX century; the most harmful for Russia Hungarian campaign of 1848; Crimean War; the "liberation" Russian-Turkish war of 1877-1878 of Alexander II - for freedom for the "brothers"; the Franco-Russian alliance of Alexander III and, finally, drawing Russia into the world war of Nicholas II - these are the main false milestones, following which we lost

right direction...

If Lenin and the Bolsheviks had not taken a sharp turn to the left, then after the "victory" in World War I with the Entente, Russia—whether monarchist, constitutional-monarchist, or bourgeois, it doesn't matter—would quickly become a de facto semi-colony of the West and the United States. Huge short-term and long-term external debts, several times higher than the entire state budget, would completely bury both the sovereignty and the free future of Russia.

Alas, having set out on the right path after October 1917 and the Civil War, we have now again strayed from it. We have strayed both because of our unreason and because the eternal supranational forces.

And again we wander, "losing even the direction" ...

Although it is obvious to the obvious!

WHILE WORKING ON THIS BOOK, I kept coping with maps—European Russia, Siberia, the Far East, Pacific, Southeast Asia and the Americas. The theme itself demanded it.

I hope that these cards have become more familiar and understandable to you, my dear reader.

And besides these private maps, I often peered at the map of the world.

Let's look at it again ... Here is the edge of mainland Asia, where Japan can also be attributed. Here above - Alaska and the Aleutians, and below - the western coast of North America ...

Between them is the Pacific Ocean, converging at an angle to the Bering Strait.

In this huge geographical "corner" - only ocean waters, waters and waters for many thousands of kilometers. And only the transverse strip of the Sandwich-Hawaiian Islands does not close this space, but turns out to be one of the vertices of the systemically integral triangle "Russia - Fort Ross - Hawaii".

Russia is a continental power. This is not only an axiom, but also a geographical fact.

Russia is also a great power. And this is also a fact!

But the natural development of Russia automatically assumed such an exit to the ocean spaces that would correspond to the scale, role and potential of Russia. How far did the Russian patriots Pyotr Alekseevich Romanov, Grigory Ivanovich Shelikhov, Alexander Andreevich Baranov, Nikolai Petrovich Rezanov look!

And how we needed our Russian America...

Talentless, criminal fools, the august brothers Alexander and Konstantin Romanov, which was the cap of Monomakh, deprived Russia of this direction of development of the power of the state.

That's why it was so easy to push us later to the "non-freezing ports" provocateur Witte!

We needed such ports, but here they are, ice-free ports - in the west of America in the former Russian California, in possible Russian Hawaii. Here they are - ports for the mighty Pacific Russian fleet. His strength was needed both in Alaska and the Aleuts, but not only there. And traditionally painted in a peaceful white color, the "white" Russian ships could well withstand the power of the "black" American ships ...

And, by the way, a little about the symbolism ...

In the United States, there is a national relic - the Liberty Bell, weighing 943.4 kilograms. Manufactured he was in London for the 50th anniversary of the Charter of Liberties, Pennsylvania's constitution, in 1751.

That is, back in the days when North America was an English colony.

Pennsylvania was then the possession of the Penn family and was named so by the English king Charles II in honor of the British admiral Sir William Penn. Paying off the debt of the crown to the Penn family (16 thousand pounds), Charles issued a patent (the so-called "Pennsylvania charter") to the son of the admiral - Quaker William Penn (the so-called "Pennsylvania charter") for lands north of Maryland. (After many years, Penny returned the right to possession of Pennsylvania to the English government for 280 thousand pounds sterling.)

In fact, Penn-son called these lands "Sylvania", and only "Pen ..." added the cheerful King Karl.

Already from Father William there was a strong smell of Freemasonry. And son William, who was born in 1644 and died in 1718, acquired such a biography that in it every now and then you come across solid symbols and signs of his connection with powerful supranational forces. So, sitting for "disobedience" in the Tower of London, the twenty-five-year-old Penn wrote the pamphlet "No Cross, No Crown", and soon ... received Pennsylvania in compensation from the British crown and began to collect all the "persecuted" across the ocean ...

In 1701, he approved a charter-constitution for the possessions of his father's name. Subsequently 24 articles This charter formed the basis of the US Constitution.

As for the "jubilee" bell mentioned above, it was cast in London, and on top of it was inscription: *"Declare freedom on earth to its inhabitants."*

These words were taken from the third Book of Moses - Leviticus, chapter 25, verse 10. This chapter begins So:

In the newest "Dictionary of American History" edited by academician Fursenko, the word "earth" in the inscription on the bell is given with a capital letter - they say that this bell was intended to announce Freedom the whole earth.

But, as can be seen from the text of the chapter of the 25th book of Leviticus, this chapter meant regional, so to speak, freedom, declared in the promised land only to the sons of Israel. And even then - only on the occasion of the anniversary. That is, speaking in modern language, it was, in fact, an amnesty.

So the inscription on the bell was of dubious content and contained a multi-layered subtle hint. There was in the inscription - if we take into account the quoted text of the biblical chapter from where the inscription was taken - and an unspoken direct hint that the subjects of the English crown would soon have to return "to their possession" ... Which happened thirty years later: the British left, and the Yankees received "freedom".

But here's how it happens! Right during the test in the courtyard of the Philadelphia State House (as in the USA they call the legislative assembly buildings) the bell ... cracked!

No, there is still God above us!

The bell was melted down twice, but in 1835, announcing the death of John Marshall, Chief Justice of the United States, it again ... cracked. And on the next anniversary of the birth of George Washington in 1846, it was completely damaged.

Yes, there is a God above us!

After a series of movements, the bell rested in a special pavilion near Independence Hall in Philadelphia...

The cracked bell of false "freedom" for the elite - as a national relic of the new "chosen people"... Could the symbol of a hypocritical, God-forgetting America be more accurate?

Hardly...

WHEN I started writing this book, I thought that it would be a story primarily about Russian American company and Russian America.

However, now, when I am at the end of a lot of work, I understand that from a certain moment this book has also become a story about the greatness of the Russian spirit, firstly, and about the importance of the competence of power in the fate of peoples - secondly ...

And above all, in the fate of the Russian people.

The Russian people are a great people, and once again we proved this with our East Siberian, Far Eastern and Pacific epic.

But these same events, these same periods in our history show and prove that what is especially significant for Russia is what constitutes its supreme power and what it is guided by... And about this in
At the end of the book, I also want to say a few words ...

If smart patriots are at the head of Russia, it gains strength and perspective. If in power there are mediocrity and "Ivans who do not remember kinship", the country is weakening and decrepit.

Alas, in Russia the second happened more often. And very often her supreme power was unworthy of the people who were subject to her. But even in such periods of confusion and vacillation, Russia was strong in the initiative and vitality of the most glorious part of her popular mass. Let us recall the heroes of the defense of Sevastopol in the Crimean War. It was a handful, but a handful that felt like a part of the State.

And Russian America?

It, if you think about it, did not even begin with Peter ... In fact, it originated in the era of Ivan the Terrible, when it began not just the expansion of the Russian state to its natural borders, but expansion deliberately initiated at the highest state level, that is, initiated and encouraged by the head of state.

Then he was an autocrat, a man who for the first time called himself "the king of all Rus'" - Ivan the Terrible ... As a true Russian patriot, he was slandered both during his lifetime and after the grave. But it was he who moved the Russians to the east. However, it was not only Grozny that mattered, but above all, the truly Russian spirit. That is, inquisitive, active, courageous, stubborn and unpretentious spirit.

Somehow I caught my eye the idea that there are, as it were, two English peoples, differing from each other even in outward appearance - a squat, clumsy plebs, common people, and a slender, lean and

elegant aristocracy...

I don't know if this is so, but I am more and more convinced that in the Russian people - and in the very thickness of its mass, and in its upper layers, there are certainly two peoples fundamentally different from one another - the people of Ivan and Marya and the people of Vanek and Manek ...

The first people beat foreigners, the second licked their heels.

The first created melodious songs that took the soul, the second - obscene ditties.

The first in a difficult time frowned, pulled up his belt and rolled up his sleeves, the second - fooled around.

The second lived anyhow, not very interested even in what is there beyond the distant forest. The second strove to lie down on the stove, and the first ...

And the first went to distant lands - not conquering them, but organically absorbing them into the circle of Russian affairs.

It was precisely the movement of the nation ... The West sent predatory adventurers, then missionaries, and then administrators, colonists.

And the Russian Ivan, the son of Ivan and Marya, went to the new lands of Western, Central, Eastern Siberia immediately as an exponent of the general Russian will - due to the breadth of character. And even if he seemed to be following yasak and "soft junk", then - in the end - he was following the fate of the Russian land ...

A good, in general, person - the Norwegian Fridtjof Nansen, looked at the history of the issue as *follows* : - yes! - *S.K.) to conquer the Russian Tsar the kingdom and thereby bought himself a pardon - and it continued more or less by chance, with the help of various adventurers ... "*

They were given to them - these Europeans, "adventurers" ... But what! For them, to move three hundred kilometers from home for centuries was an adventure! And for Russians three hundred miles - read that he never left the house...

Nansen's view is quite typical - if we keep in mind both his superficiality and his lack of understanding of the essence of a truly Russian character. And so he did not understand that it was not by chance, not by chance that the "conquest", but in fact - the development, of Siberia by the Russian people began.

We naturally mastered it and ... And in a natural and unconstrained way we went to the Eastern Ocean. And after that, the movement to Russian America became a national affair. It was not interrupted even in such an anti-national reign as the reign of Anna Ioannovna, in the time of Bironism. It was during her reign that Bering went on his Second Kamchatka Expedition, and the navigator Gvozdev described the North American shores ...

And the "era of Baranov"!

I have already said a lot about her and about him. However, Russia is so indebted to the memory of this man that, by God, it would not be out of place to say here about him and about his era once again - in the words of another outstanding Russian person, the same Alexei Efimovich Vandam (Edrikhin).

And again I cannot give the floor to Alexei Efimovich in a patter. Let the reader read Vandam's inspirational lines about Alexander Andreevich in full:

"This very modest origin and in appearance little resemblance to a hero, until the age of fifty, hid in himself the talents of a natural leader and a great state builder. Having under his command only employees of the company and the Aleuts, who were not distinguished by their courage, Baranov moved the company's main apartment from the island of Kodiak to the mainland inhabited by ferocious ears and to

Sitka Bay laid the capital of Russian America Novo-Arkhangelsk. Here, following the construction of a fort with 16 short and 42 long guns, a shipyard appeared for building ships, a copper foundry that supplied bells (not cracked. - S.K.) to the churches of New Spain. The capital, whose white population quickly increased to 800 families, was adorned with a church, schools, a library, and even an art gallery (remember the Sakhalin officials described by Chekhov, who went to the Japanese "for comfort" - S.K.). Forty miles away, a hospital and a bathhouse were built near the mineral springs.

As the center of the most important fur trade at that time, Novo-Arkhangelsk became the first port on the Pacific Ocean, leaving the Spanish San Francisco far behind (let me remind you, about the 10s of the 19th century. - S.K.). All the ships that sailed in the waters there converged to him. Warmly welcoming all foreign guests, Baranov did not lose sight of Russian interests for a minute ... he worked tirelessly to strengthen our position.

At sea, every year he increased the number of Russian ships, dotted the islands with Russian trading posts, started trade relations with foreign ports, and on land he went further and further into the depths of the mainland, paving the way with the help of the clergy and securing the construction of forts. Russian possessions grew to the east, and to the north, and to the south ...

In general, during his tenure at the head of the company, Baranov did for Russia what no mere mortal could do. He conquered and brought her as a gift the entire northern half of the Pacific Ocean, which he actually turned into the "Russian Lake", and on the other side of this ocean an entire empire, equal to half of European Russia, which began to be populated by Russians and provided with fortifications, arsenals and workshops in a way that Siberia has been secured so far...

With the departure of this great man, the heroic period of Russian activity in the Pacific ended.
ocean..."

Alas, yes...

AND HERE IS HOW the French Marquis Astolfe de Custine wrote about Russia and Russians at the end of the first half of the 19th century: *"There are no great people in Russia, because there are no independent characters ... Russians lack a scientific spirit, they have no creative power, they have a mind by nature lazy and superficial ... Russians are good soldiers, but bad sailors; in general, they are more inclined to humility than to the manifestation of their will. Their mind lacks momentum, their spirit lacks freedom... What a country! An endless, flat, like a palm, plain without colors, without outlines ... Through this country without landscapes*
huge rivers flow, but devoid of a hint of color.

Okay, it's French. Yes, and an ill-wisher ... Russian is an undoubted patriot (although he was often reproached for exactly the opposite) - Pyotr Yakovlevich Chaadaev wrote around the same years when de Custine visited Russia, this is what: *"It would be an exaggeration to be sad at least for a minute for fate people, from the depths of which came the mighty nature of Peter the Great, the all-embracing mind of Lomonosov and the graceful genius of Pushkin ...*

Wonderful!

However...

However, he also wrote, unfortunately, and this is what: *"Cutted, cast, created by our rulers and our climate, only by virtue of humility did we become a great people ... There is one fact that dominates our historical movement, which runs like a red thread through our entire history, which contains, so to speak, its entire philosophy, which manifests itself in all epochs of our social life and determines their character, which is at the same time an essential element of our political greatness, and true*

the cause of our mental impotence is a geographical fact.

According to Chaadaev, it turned out that, they say, we have spread widely, but we "swim" shallowly ... And "Geography" is one burden for us...

And here is one more - I do not argue - a very intelligent Russian man, Nikolai Alexandrovich Berdyaev: *"The size of the Russian state posed almost unbearable tasks for the Russian people ... And this left a bleak stamp on the life of a Russian person ... There are no Russian people creative play of forces. The Russian soul is crushed by the vast Russian fields... The vast expanses of Russia fell like a heavy burden on the soul of the Russian people... The vastness of the Russian spaces did not contribute to the development of self-discipline and self-activity in the Russian person... The Russian soul is bruised (how is he! - S.K.) breadth..."*

Oh, writers-"thinkers"! For them, Russian spaces were a source of dejection!

But they, looking at life not through the eyes of its transducer, through Peter's "window", but looking at it from the window of their thoughts, completely forgot that these spaces themselves were the result of the active activity of the Russian people, the result of his calm movement forward and forward!

They would say to the "scorer" Pyotr Alekseevich Romanov, Mikhail Lomonosov, Semyon Dezhnev, Yerofey Khabarov, Khariton Laptev, Andrei Tolstykh, Grigory Shelikhov, Gerasim Izmailov, Gavriil Syrychev, Alexander Baranov, Ivan Kruzenshtern, Yuri Lisyansky, Ivan Kuskov, Vasily Golov Nina, Ferdinand Wrangel, Nikolai Muravyov-Amursky, Gennady Nevelsky, that the Russian soul is bruised (!) by the breadth ...

I think that at first they simply would not understand that this is said about their souls and the souls of their comrades and associates, and when they understood, they would ask - perhaps with anger, and perhaps with laughter: "And you, dear man, didn't your mother accidentally hurt you when you were a child?"

And if the Russian soul was bruised with anything up to bloody bruises, it was the idiocy of the rulers, absolutely unworthy of this Russian soul.

Yes, "geography" really taught us to endure them for centuries and see national value in the institution of autocracy for a long time, but not as a spatial factor, but as a historical factor ... Rus' had to take on the flood that poured into it from the Wild Steppe, and weaken it so what about Europe
only smoothed waves of it came ...

From that it went...

Back in the 11th century, the Russian supreme leaders, by right of the first among equals, were related to the supreme leaders of Europe. The Kiev prince Yaroslav the Wise gave his daughters: Nastasya - for the king of the Hungarian Andrey, Elizabeth - for the king of the Norwegian and Swedish Harald, Anna - for the French king Henry.

And before Yaroslav, and - for some time - after him, this was a standard practice for Kievan Rus, how much later kinship with the reigning houses of Europe became commonplace for post-Petrine Russia.

It was an honor for the illiterate French Heinrich to receive the brilliant, educated Russian princess Yaroslavna as his wife ... Already in 1715, when Peter was in Paris, he was shown the coronation attributes of the French crown in the Reims Cathedral. There was also a certain ancient sacred book, written in a language unknown to the French, in which, according to tradition, French queens swore allegiance.

Peter took it in his hands and, to everyone's amazement, began ... to freely read it - old Russian

"Psalter", brought to the provincial Paris of the 11th century by the mermaid Anna from the capital city of Kyiv ...

But by the middle of the 13th century, the situation had completely changed. The Russian grand dukes married only "their own", Russian women, and did not marry their daughters further to Rus'. The Russian princess became a low price acquisition, for Rus' did not stand high in the eyes of the West.

We received the Tatar region as a result of the specific division of the Russian lands after the death of Yaroslav. We got rid of the Tatar region - like a yoke, having become under the banner of Moscow that unites the Russian land, the banner centralization...

But have we got rid of the Tatar region as a spiritual heritage of the three black ages during which it lasted?

In his amazingly interesting work "The Chinese in the Ussuri Territory" Vladimir Klavdievich Arseniev wrote bitter lines:

"... The Chinese do not live alone, but by several people. Even where there are twenty or thirty of them, there are no quarrels or they are extremely rare. The next day after the quarrel, the same Chinese work together again, looking as if they had not quarreled.

In this respect, the Russian settlers are the exact opposite of the Chinese. Where three or four of them gather, quarrels begin the next day, and after that the deliberate weeding of each other's arable land begins. How many before my eyes ... artel enterprises collapsed just because their partners quarreled among themselves and did not bring the matter to the end!

Artel enterprises were collapsing before Arsenyev's eyes... And before our eyes and with our stupidest behavior is collapsing - by us, by our quarrels, the great Soviet Union ...

What a shame - Arseniev wrote about the Russian people sad, however - the truth. The truth that Russians, alas, often behave in such a way that they can be called a people of stupid individualists. But Arseniev is also a deeply Russian person. However, he was a staunch collectivist.

Actually, if among the Russian people there were not many of the same convinced, born collectivists Ivanov and Mariy, then great Russia simply would not have taken place!

However, the Tatar region greatly distorted the Russian national character. But the Tatar yoke made the Russians appreciate the centralization of power, providing external security.

Accustomed to appreciating strong power and obeying it, the Russian people over the years got used to obeying power in general. And the all-powerful power was not always both strong and useful for the future of Russia. By the second half of the 19th century, it increasingly manifested itself as a factor not so much national as anti-national ... And this was most clearly manifested in the 19th century in the fact of the sale of Russian America.

It was no longer sovereign sovereigns, but the royal bars of the Romanovs who criminally neglected the age-old through the efforts of a truly powerful and national movement of Russians towards a great and lasting geopolitical future!

The strength and greatness of Moscow arose on the basis of the ideas of unification and centralization. And therefore, even pre-Petrine Rus' and its leaders were, in the final analysis, geopolitically wealthy. Clever Peter is clever Peter, and that says it all.

Catherine the Great forever connected two eras - her own and Peter's, not only with a simple inscription "To Peter I - Catherine II" on the falconet "Bronze Horseman", but also with a general attitude towards Russia. Peter in front of Poltava said: "Not for Peter, but for the Fatherland, handed to Peter ..." Catherine called Russia "Universe".

Flickering in history Paul, his wavering son Alexander and unwavering son

Nicholas ruled Russia as best they could...

Alexandra II and III, and especially Nicholas II, Russia no longer actually ruled - it was ruled more and more by its external debts and by those who plunged Russia into these debts ...

Soviet Russia, though not immediately, restored geopolitical expediency in Russian foreign policy. Alas, during the Brezhnev era, as the "fifth column" formed, our foreign policy, including in relation to the Far East, also lost its sanity, wide view and responsibility for the Fatherland.

Expanding over the centuries to its natural limits and then losing such an important geopolitical bastion as Russian America, Russia had to focus on internal development, providing peaceful conditions for it with its foreign policy ... Instead, the tsars and "vipis" dragged us to the Balkans, to Manchuria and to East Prussia.

And the "fifth column" in the USSR drew us into the Khrushchev-Brezhnev "export of revolution and socialism", the mediocre logical conclusion of which was Afghanistan.

Today we are faced with the task of no longer expanding, but a new gathering of the Russian state.

And this is **our** task!

AND LAST...

The author in the process of work, and the reader - in the process of reading, met or saw dozens of outstanding Russian people in their best qualities as pioneers, hard workers and patriots.

The American Bernard Peyton, having reached Russia from San Francisco via Canton, Calcutta, Alexandria and London, wrote to his wife in the summer of 1856 about Russia, formally already the Russia of Alexander II, but in fact still Nikolaev: "These Russians - how slow they are ! *They have no idea of the value of time...*"

But in those same years, the Frenchman Edmond de Hailly admired the skill and diligence of the heroes of the now forgotten defense of Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky in the Crimean War - General Zavoiko and the commander of the Aurora frigate, Lieutenant Commander Izylmetyev. De Hailly compared them to Admiral Nelson, who valued time, and exclaimed: "*How admirable is their ability to use time!*"

Yes, although Russia has rarely been rich in competent, responsible and devoted to Russia rulers, it has always been rich in active Russian patriots. Russia was rich in them, and is still rich today. And they should have power in Russia - workers and patriots.

Many people, both inside and outside Russia, interfere and want to prevent this. However, we have not so few potential friends in the outside world, or, in any case, potential partners. In Europe, they may be led by Germany. And in Asia, among them may be our three Far Eastern neighbors - China, Japan and Korea. After all, only such an option would be reasonable for us and for them.

Imperial England had no permanent friends - they were replaced by permanent interests. The Evil Empire - the United States, today is losing understanding even of its own interests, not to mention the interests of mankind.

And simple-hearted Russia had many unfaithful "friends" both in pre- and post-revolutionary times. Therefore, we should not get carried away by the desire for all sorts of "friendships". However, we need and we can have loyal partners if we start to respect ourselves. If we start moving towards a new Great Russia.

At the same time, we also need to know our old enemies, who will never change their attitude towards Russia.

We need to understand that the new greatness of Russia will put an end to the plans of the Mammon-Anglo-Saxon world dictate.

Yes, it will give a new and human chance to the whole Planet. But this is what frightens the enemies of mankind.

Therefore, among other things, I tried to show how ominously and how long these supranational forces, which have made the United States a lever for their actions, have been striving to diminish the hope of the world - Russia.

In the 18th century, Russia began to explore Russian America.

In the 19th century, she first developed it, and then - mediocrely handed over to America "state".

In the 20th century, Russia successfully overtook America and successfully resisted it.

The current Russia of the 21st century mediocrely surrenders to this America the past, present and future of Russia Eternal...

Where to find the strength to confront and win?

The answer is obvious - in yourself.

In the power of example and in the life of ancestors.

In the great Russian history...

Kremlin,

August 18, 2004, 01:07 - October 22, 2004,

10 hours 41 minutes.

about the author

SERGEY KREMLEV

(Sergey Tarasovich Brezkun)

Ukrainian. Born October 7, 1951 in Dnepropetrovsk in the family of a railway engineer.

He graduated from secondary school named after A.S. Pushkin in Kerch and the engine building faculty of the Kharkov Order of Lenin Aviation Institute. NOT. Zhukovsky. By specialty - rocket engine.

After serving in the coastal units of the Black Sea Fleet from 1978 to the present, he has been an employee of the oldest center for the development of Soviet nuclear weapons in the city of Arzamas-16 (later - the city of Kremlev, now - the city of Sarov, Nizhny Novgorod Region).

He took part in the development and design of thermonuclear charges, in 1981 he participated in ground tests at the Semipalatinsk test site.

In 2003 he was elected professor at the Academy of Military Sciences.

Author of numerous publications in periodicals on a wide range of socio-political and military-political topics, including the conceptual problems of nuclear weapons.

He works a lot as a children's poet, regularly publishes in the Murzilka magazine.

Co-author (with I.I. Nikitchuk) of two small books "START-2 at a glance" and "21st century. Will Russia have a nuclear weapons complex? (the latter was published as an official publication of the State Duma of the Russian Federation), as well as (with V.N. Mikhailov) - the book "Good or Evil? (Philosophy of a stable world).

During 2003–2004, the ACT publishing house published three books by Sergei Kremlev (Brezkun) on Russian-German and Soviet-German relations in the Great Confrontation series: "Russia and Germany - play off!", "Russia and Germany - together or apart?" and "Russia and Germany: Path to a Pact".